

THE  
AMERICAN QUARTERLY  
CHURCH REVIEW.

---

---

VOL. XIV.

JULY, 1861.

No. 2.

---

---

ART. 1.—THE ULTIMATE GROUNDS OF INFIDELITY.

1. *The Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Holy Scripture Records, stated anew with special reference to the doubts and Discoveries of Modern Times, in Eight Lectures, delivered in the Oxford University Pulpit, in the year 1859, on the Bampton Foundation, by GEORGE RAWLINSON, M. A., late Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College, Editor of the History of Herodotus, &c.—from the London Edition, with Notes, translated by Rev. A. N. ARNOLD. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1860. 12mo. pp. 454.*
2. *The History of Herodotus, A new English Version, edited with copious Notes and Appendices, illustrating the History and Geography of Herodotus, from the most recent sources of information, and embodying the chief results, Historical and Ethnological, which have been obtained in the progress of Cuneiform and Hieroglyphical discovery. By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M. A., late Fellow, &c.—assisted by COL. SIR HENRY RAWLINSON, K. C. B., and SIR J. G. WILKINSON, F. R. S. In four Volumes, with Maps and Illustrations.* VOL. XIV.—NO. II.

tions. New York : D. Appleton & Co. 1859. 8vo. Vol. I. pp. 563. Vol. II. pp. 514. Vol. III. pp. 463. Vol. IV. pp.—

3. *A Critical and Historical Introduction to the Canonical Scriptures of the Old Testament, from the German of Wilhelm Martin Leberecht De Wette*,—translated and enlarged by THEODORE PARKER, Minister of the Second Church in Roxbury. In two Volumes—third edition. Boston : Rufus Lighton, Jr. 1859. 8vo. pp. 517, and 570.
4. *An Historico-Critical Introduction to the Canonical Books of the New Testament*. By WILHELM MARTIN LEBERECHE DE WETTE, Doctor of Theology and regular Professor in the University of Basel. Translated from the fifth improved and enlarged edition, by FREDERICK FROTHINGHAM. Boston : Crosby, Nichols & Co. 1858. 8vo. pp. 388.

ALL the objections that have been or can be urged against the credibility of the Holy Scriptures, admit of being referred to three classes.

1. Objections based on the inconsistency—real or supposed—between the teachings of the Scriptures and the ascertained facts and principles of Science.
2. Objections based upon historic inaccuracies—real or supposed—found in the Holy Scriptures, when compared with other authentic and reliable sources of information concerning the same historic events as those that are spoken of in the Bible, and,
3. Objections based upon the contents of the Scriptures themselves, when compared with other parts and teachings of the same Scriptures, or with the common sense and opinions of mankind.

It will readily be conceded, that objections to the credibility of any book claiming to have come from God, might exist, in either of these classes, sufficient to render its reception impossible, without an entire surrender of man's noblest faculties, and his subjecting himself to most debasing superstition and spiritual despotism. We naturally assume that whatever has come from God cannot but be *true*, and so, elevating to the



intellect ; *pure*, and so, beneficial to the moral nature of man. And to these first principles of truth and right, we subject all systems and documents that come to us with a claim upon our assent and submission. But the scrutiny, however indispensable, is by no means an easy one. Nor is it without its peculiar and serious perils. And accordingly we have infidels, men who reject the Scriptures on grounds belonging to each of these classes ; some of them, doubtless, honest and earnest minds, entangled in doubts that they cannot remove, and others as certainly disbelievers from an evil conscience, rejecting the Scriptures, because they do not want to believe what they teach. Still, however, it is an earnest and a blessed work to vindicate the claims of the Holy Volume to all our reverence and our confidence, as the sheet-anchor of our souls, the source of all our reliable and satisfying knowledge of Him in Whom we live and move and have our being.

Objections to the credibility of the Scriptures, based on the inconsistency between their teachings and the attainments of Science, must assume, of course, that what are regarded as the truths of Science are true ; and so true, that they may be assumed as a test and standard by which to judge of the truth of all other books and teachings. Nay, these truths of Science must be regarded as absolutely true, and beyond possibility of error or mistake, before we can safely assume, that whatever is apparently irreconcilable with them must be rejected and cast away as false. It is a work of no slight magnitude or responsibility to say, that that Volume—which is so dear to millions of human hearts, has led so many thousands to repentance and peace, sustained such multitudes in the hours of temptation and discouragement, and is in fact so inwrought into all our modes of thought and identified with our civilization, that it cannot now be discredited without leaving all our life and hopes a mere wreck of ruins—is, after all, but an imposture, full of errors, myths, contradictions and absurdities. And he who has closely considered the history of Science, how it has progressed with but faltering and erring steps, how many of its most vaunted teachings in one age have been repudiated as errors in the next, will certainly be very cautious about re-

pudiating, on any such grounds, that which has been of such inestimable value as, in all ages, the blessed old Bible has proved itself to be. Doubtless there are thousands who will say, if worst must come to worst, 'Give us the old Bible, and raise no doubts of its truthfulness. Perish Science, if need be, we care nothing for that; we can live without it. But, without the hope of immortality, based upon the truth of God's teachings in His Holy Word, we cannot live, and do not dare to die.'

We must, then, be extremely cautious how we admit any proposition as a truth of Science which militates at all against the received teachings of the Holy Scriptures. But, besides this, we have another caution to give. We cannot go into any general discussion of the subject now, but we will remark in passing, that we must always remember that the Bible was not given us to teach us Science, but rather the way of salvation. And more than this; the writers of the Holy Scriptures could not accomplish their object without some allusion to matters that come within the domain of Science. For example, in speaking of the earth and the heavenly bodies, the Scriptures are speaking of objects that come within the teachings, discoveries and discussions of Astronomy and Geology. In speaking of the miracles of healing, the sacred writers encounter the theories of disease and cure. Now, at the time when the Scriptures were written, there were no Sciences of Geology, Astronomy, and of Disease and Health. Hence, in Astronomy, the sacred writers speak, according to appearances, of the sun's rising and setting, &c., notwithstanding modern Science has taught every school boy of our day, that not the sun but the earth revolves. So in regard to other Sciences, Geology and Medicine for example, in speaking of the creation of the earth and the cure of disease, the end in view was to teach that *God created* the world, and that *Christ healed* the sick, and not to inculcate any theory or science of the original formation of the earth, and the physiology and pathology of human life. The sacred writers must therefore, of necessity, have used the terms and formularies that belonged to the theories and views then prevalent, and thus have given to them a certain

amount of apparent sanction. Suppose, for example, that Moses, instead of the revelation he has given us in the first chapter of Genesis, had written in the phraseology and according to the views of modern Science in the department of Geology, who in that far off age would have understood him? Who, until within the last quarter of a century, would have *believed* him? Nay, it would have taken a volume much larger than all the five Books ascribed to him, to make the proper definitions and preliminary explanations, in order that he might state the fact that God created the earth and all things therein, as those things are now understood, and in terms and principles which are in accordance with modern Science. And so with our Lord's miracles of healing—were these actual demoniacal possessions? We do not propose to discuss the question. But that was, undoubtedly, the theory in His age of many forms of disease of which we now have a different theory, and which we refer to no such agency as their cause. Now suppose that the men of His age were wrong and we are right, was it the work for Him to do, to teach medicine, physiology and pathology, with the theory and practice of medicine? Certainly not. And suppose He had set Himself to correct their error; this work could not have been accomplished in all the time and with all the labor allowed for the three years of His Ministry and the preaching of the Gospel of our Salvation. Nay more, His contradiction of the commonly received doctrines concerning the things that pertain to this world, would have immeasurably increased the difficulties, already alarmingly great, in the way of His reception as the Son of God, and the acceptance of his teachings concerning God, the Soul, and Eternity. Doubtless the men of that age were as confident that what they regarded as scientific truth was true and indisputable, as the most pretentious savans of our day are or can be, with regard to the attainments of our age, notwithstanding they were wrong for the most part, and we are, as we believe, for the most part right in what we hold and teach.

It was therefore of inevitable necessity that the Sacred writers should assume and use some expressions which would imply

the truth and adoption of the prevailing theories and doctrines of Science in their age ; and yet they must not be held responsible for those theories, or as having given to them the sanction of their authority as inspired men of God. Nor can we, in any right view of the case, regard any correction of the scientific errors which prevailed in the ages when the Scriptures were written,—even though they were thus indirectly assumed into the Scriptures themselves,—as any good ground for distrust of the sacred writers, or for a rejection of the Scriptures as unworthy of credit. We do not know that it is necessary, in order to save his credit, to suppose that Moses, for example, knew all that Geology has yet attained unto in regard to the origin and history of this earth, the formation of its strata and the untold varieties of fossil remains that lie buried therein. But we do know that if he had known it, he could not have *made it known* to the men of his age ; and even the attempt to inculcate it to the people whom he was raised up to deliver, would have occasioned, beyond hope or remedy, his rejection as an impostor. We may regard it as beyond question, that the use of the views and terms of *modern* Science by Moses would have as certainly secured the rejection of his message in *his* day, as any endorsement of the views and errors of that age could lead us *in modern times* to doubt his mission from God, because of the errors in Geology to which he would in that case have committed himself and his entire work of preparing for the coming of the Messiah. What then should he do ? He must speak of the creation of the world. He must say that God created it. He could not use both theories—the ancient and the modern—even if he understood the modern never so thoroughly. The fact that God created the world, was one of the essential facts which he had to inculcate ; the time when, the *modus operandi*, and the details of the process, were in no way essential to the object he had before him. Suppose, then, that his language shall be found to be irreconcilable with what we have ascertained beyond question to be fact ; we do not admit that such is the case, but we may suppose that it is so—is this fact to shake our confidence in the spiritual teachings of the Sacred writer ? We think not. We have recog-

nized the principle here referred to, in the case of the language that implies a false theory of the motions of the heavenly bodies, and nobody *now* supposes that the credibility of the Holy Scriptures has been at all diminished thereby. We may find it necessary to extend this same principle still farther, as Science shall make other advances in its knowledge of the works of the Creator. And, without any farther discussion of the principle on this occasion, and without attempting now to point out precisely the limit beyond which it can never be safely or properly applied, we will only say, farther, that its legitimate application may, indeed, lead to more adequate and just views of the nature and design of Revelation, than we even yet possess; but it can never lead to any subversion of our reasonable faith in the Word of God, as being, as it is in truth, the Word of Eternal Life, and as affording us the knowledge and means of the way of Salvation.

It is certainly worthy of much consideration, that while *all* the other systems of religion and theology which prevailed in the early ages of the world did, so far as we can now ascertain, set forth, not merely the fact, but some account or theory of the origin of the world and the mode of its existence, as, in part at least, the *direct object of their teachings*,—the Bible, on the other hand, treats all these questions and matters of Science, as merely subordinate, matters to which indeed some allusion must be made, but concerning which the authors had no special word or mission to teach. Moses, for example, wanted and needed to say, most emphatically and most explicitly, that GOD *created* the Heavens and the Earth and all things that are therein. We can see how, without such an assertion and such a claim for the Being whose Will he professed to reveal and inculcate for the obedience of the people, he must have failed of making upon their minds the necessary impression, and satisfying them that the God Whom he called them to worship was in very deed none other than the God of Heaven and Earth, God over all—even God of gods. But he must not only assert the fact; something of detail and speciality were necessary, in order that the declaration of the fact might make a due impression upon the minds of the hearers, and pre-

clude, then and forever, all disposition to look to the other and more pretentious systems, for information which this Revelation had failed to give. But the Sacred writer, while declaring these things, has, most manifestly, at all times, his eye on something higher and beyond, to which this is but subservient, and without which this would not, in the comparison, be worth the trouble of saying. And hence it is, that while any and all possible advances that may be made in the Natural Sciences, when properly understood and adjusted, have left, as they always will leave, our faith in Revelation proper, undisturbed and undiminished ; these same attainments in the Natural Sciences have already sapped the very foundation of all the other systems of cosmology, the Chinese, the Hindu, the Persian, the Babylonian, the Phenician, the Egyptian, the Greek, the Roman, the Scandinavian—all of these,—and put them in a light where it is absolutely impossible to regard them as anything else than the merest creations of an idle fancy, or the sadly corrupted traditions of an earlier age, and of a far better knowledge of the things pertaining to God.

But we must pass to our second point ; and here we shall delay but a short time. Our main object under this head is, to say explicitly and emphatically, that though the modern schools of infidelity, comprehended under the class commonly known as rationalistic or German, are, in the very common estimation, based upon recent discoveries in ancient history, from which the objectors infer that the Scriptures are so full of historic errors and mistakes, that they cannot be regarded as worthy of much credit, yet nevertheless, in fact, no such discrepancies have been brought to light. Of inconsistencies and contradictions *in the Bible itself*, and between one and another of the declarations and assertions made in it, we do not here speak, but we speak of discrepancies between its statements and the ascertained facts of ancient history, and more especially the discoveries and developments made in quite recent times in Egypt, and farther East, in Asia ; and we say, that every discovery that can be regarded as at all beyond dispute as to its meaning and relations, is altogether and entirely confirmatory of the Scripture statements in every point and particular



where there is any connection at all between the two. And it is with reference to this point, that we have placed at the head of our Article the two works of Mr. Rawlinson named there. In his edition of Herodotus, he has collected, with wonderful diligence and arranged with great skill, in notes, &c., all that has thus far been really discovered. He has made a magazine, from which all students of history must hereafter draw—a book, without which no library of any pretensions will be regarded as complete. And the American Publishers, the Appletons, have laid us under great obligation, by doing their part so well towards bringing this most inestimable work so completely within the reach of all.

But, in the “Lectures on the Historical Evidences,” the Author has put the material thus brought to light to most excellent use. He has produced an exceedingly interesting book, well written, forcible and convincing. In his notes, he constantly refers to the Herodotus for further illustrations and confirmations of what he says in the Lectures. And we must be content with referring to these two works, as furnishing the confirmation of what we have said ; namely, that these recent discoveries afford no ground for doubt or scepticism in regard to the accuracy and credibility of the Holy Scriptures, but that they tend, all and altogether, in the other direction. They have cleared up many points, in which it had been claimed that there was inconsistency between the Scripture statements and other means of historic knowledge ; and, although some such points are still remaining, these discoveries raise no new ones, but give abundant promise of solving, in due time, those that still remain. Take a single instance. “It has been almost universally concluded, by those who have regarded the book of Daniel as authentic, that the Belshazzar of that book must be the same as one of the native monarchs who are known, from Berosus and Abydenus, to have occupied the throne between Nebuchadnezzar and Cyrus. And among them there was none known by the name of Belshazzar. But, it is now ascertained that Nabonadius, the last king of the Canon, associated with him on the throne, during the later years of his reign, his son, *Bil-shar-uzur*, and allowed him the royal title. And there



can be but little doubt, that it was this Prince who conducted the defense of Babylon, and was slain in the massacre which followed upon the capture." p. 139, and line 36, on p. 354. This is but one out of the many instances furnished by Mr. Rawlinson, in which a recent discovery has removed the grounds on which it had been before claimed that there was an irreconcilable contradiction between the Scripture statements and the well-ascertained facts of history. And, we repeat, that *all* the discoveries tend to confirm the accuracy of the Holy Scriptures in their historic statements and allusions. We cannot now recall a single exception. And we apprehend that in making this statement we are saying what a great many of our readers will be glad to see and hear. The impression has been very commonly and very extensively made, that our modern infidelity is based, in part at least, on discrepancies between the Holy Scriptures and the recently discovered facts of history. It is known that recent investigators—of whom the name of Niebuhr is generally and well known—have made great inroads upon what had been previously held and taught concerning the early nations of antiquity, and especially concerning Greece and Rome; and in reading and hearing the oft repeated charges of historic inaccuracy and absurdity, which have been brought against the Scriptures, most persons have supposed that some reference was had to some of the discoveries which had thus been made. But, even in this matter, we must distinguish between the *discoveries* which have actually *been made* in the East, by means of deciphering the ancient monuments and inscriptions, and the *results* which have been announced as based upon the *conjectures* of critics. Doubtless they have swept away much error, and thrown much doubt upon other facts, which, without being wholly disproved, are left without any satisfactory explanation. We have been led to disbelieve much that had been before regarded as truth, and left without knowing what to believe. And if we are required to accept these results of a mere rash and headlong criticism as ascertained facts, and to apply the same principles of criticism to the Holy Scriptures, we shall, doubtless, very soon lose our confidence in their trustworthiness. Such principles of criti-

cism will lead us to regard *all* narratives of miracles as fabulous, and *all* reference to God as the Author of laws, institutions, &c., or as guiding and commanding men, as mere "*pragmatism*," a mere superstitious reference to God, for the purpose of either giving sanction to something which the authors of the books wished especially to commend to reverential observance, or, as explaining something that might otherwise seem incredible. Doubtless we find, in the earliest literature of all nations, fables and myths, which cannot be regarded as authentic history. Most of these, also, unquestionably relate to what would be, if it were true, supernatural and miraculous. But we have no right to assume, that, because most systems of false religion make such claims falsely, therefore all such claims are false, and to be repudiated on that account. Does God interfere in the affairs of men and of the world, working miracles? This certainly is a distinct question by itself, and cannot be settled in the negative, though it might in the affirmative, and as a matter of fact, from history, or any other *a posteriori* method of investigation and proof. And without the assumption that God does not interfere, we cannot apply the same principles of historic criticism to the Bible as to other books, and thus make it incredible, merely because it claims to be a Revelation from God. But let us pass to the third class of objections, namely:

Objections based upon the nature of the contents of the Holy Scriptures themselves. And of these there are manifestly two classes; (*a*) those which are based upon alleged contradictions between different passages of Holy Scripture, when compared with one another, and (*b*) objections based upon preconceived notions of our own concerning what the contents of the Scriptures ought to be.

And first, a word of the alleged contradictions in the statements of Scriptures themselves.

It will readily occur to all our readers, that in this class there cannot well be any *new* grounds of objection; the Scriptures, *as we have them*, have been in the hands of believers, and accessible to sceptics for several centuries; in fact, ever since they were written. And, notwithstanding all we may claim on

the score of improvements in the art and principles of criticism, nothing new has been discovered or ever can be discovered by that means, in this department of the evidences of Revelation. Even though this improvement might help us to the comprehension of what was before doubtful and obscure, it cannot bring to light a contradiction that had not before been detected; for the obvious and sufficient reason, that wherever there is any obscurity or uncertainty as to the meaning, that doubt must go to the benefit of the Scriptures themselves. We have no more right in the interpretation of the Holy Volume to make difficulties and contradictions which do not exist, or magnify uncertainties of meaning into certain proofs of either ignorance or fraud, or both, than in the interpretation of any other book, even though it were the production of the humblest mortal that ever took a pen in his hand. And we may add, as an observation which we are sure all experience, and the testimony of all candid students and observers will confirm, that the number of supposed contradictions and discrepancies does not increase, but rather diminishes with the amount of study devoted to the investigation of the contents of Holy Scripture. Many men, in all ages of the world, who have found at first so many difficulties and irreconcilable statements in the Scriptures, that *they thought* they could not accept them as the Word of God, have found, on further study, and perhaps with some change in the *animus* with which those studies were conducted, that the difficulties either disappeared wholly, or ceased to present any serious obstacle in the way of a truly religious faith.

But, in the second place, a remark which follows from the former is this, that all these discrepancies and contradictions are on the surface; they appear at the first glance, catch the eye of the superficial reader, and, we had almost said, hang as obstacles only in the mind of the thoughtless or perverse one.

It is not our object to speak of the bearing which these discrepancies, whether fancied or real, must have upon our theories of Inspiration; but we would call attention, in passing, to the use that has been well made of them, as a matter of argument,

bearing upon the credibility of the Scriptures. Being on the surface, and in unimportant details alone, they are not such as any cautious impostor, who had thoroughly studied his subject, would allow to escape. And, if we suppose that the author or authors of these Books were not cautious, or did not thoroughly understand their subject, then, beyond all question, discrepancies, inconsistencies and contradictions, of a character so fundamental and irreconcilable as to leave no room for even a question of their spuriousness, would, most undoubtedly, have been detected long before this time. If the writers of Holy Scripture were not either divinely inspired or most profoundly acquainted with their subject in all its bearings, in writings of such a nature there would be most manifest indications of incongruity between them. If, on the other hand, they were either divinely inspired, or conscious of thoroughly comprehending their subject and writing in good faith, they might very naturally be negligent of mere unimportant details, and thus allow apparent discrepancies to escape them. In this view, discrepancies of this character become proofs of sincerity in the writers, and thus confirmatory of the contents of their writings.

That such discrepancies occur, of course admits of no doubt. Take one case alone—the inscription over the Cross. We have what purports to be that superscription, given by the four Evangelists, word for word, as follows :

MATTHEW.	MARK.	LUKE.	JOHN.
This is Jesus, the King of the Jews.	The King of the Jews.	This is the King of the Jews.	Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews.

Now, if it was one, it could not be another of these sentences, since no two of them are alike. Say, if you will, that Matthew, for example, has given us the Hebrew, Mark the Latin, and Luke the Greek, and that they were not the same, word for word, in each of the three languages, yet there remains a fault, with no account for its verbal discrepancy with the others. But, what of it ? In reference to its bearing on what is called the theory of a plenary verbal inspiration, we do not see how its force can be evaded ; the Holy Ghost could not have been in error, and if He had guided the Evangelists in the se-

lection of the words which they should use, the words of the superscription could not have been different in any two of the writers thus inspired. But does this discrepancy raise or sustain any doubt that Christ was crucified, or that a superscription was placed over His head? Assuredly not. But, on the contrary, on every well-established principle of evidence, such discrepancy in the unessential details, when there is an agreement in the main fact, confirms the strength of the testimony to that fact. No conscious, intentional impostor, would allow such obvious discrepancies to escape him. Conscious of the fact that he is attempting to deceive others, he would be exceedingly careful of marks and signs by which his design might betray itself, or be proved upon him, in case it should be suspected. Nothing but an utter shamelessness of falsification, when there is no longer any expectation or wish to be regarded as worthy of confidence on the one hand, or the most thorough sincerity of truth and moral earnestness on the other, ever renders persons indifferent to those external and *prima facie* indications of the character of their acts, from which the first impressions with regard to them are obtained. Nor, on the other hand, do we believe that it has ever yet occurred in human history, that two or more minds,—acting independently of each other, or even acting by that sort of collusion which may arise from one man's attempting to carry out and complete a delusion which another had begun, with only the work of the predecessor before him, as a means of acquiring a knowledge of his plans and designs,—have been able to coöperate in imposing upon the world a delusion, without leaving some of their tracks uncovered, without involving and interweaving into their plan some deep and fundamental error or inconsistency, which, when it has once been detected and exposed, has forever dispelled the delusion, and rendered it forever after powerless for harm over all intelligent minds. And it would certainly require in all cases less sagacity to discover the fraud and imposture, than it would to bury them so deep and cover them so closely that they could not be discovered.

But it is time to hasten to our final topic—the one on account of which our Article has been mainly written, notwith-

standing we have been so long arriving at it, namely, the Infidelity that is based upon our preconceived notions as to what the Scriptures ought to contain, and the way in which they ought to be written.

We have a form of Infidelity that has grown up lately, and is becoming very prevalent, known as *German Infidelity*, which belongs to this class, and constitutes, in fact, the chief manifestation of the Infidelity from this cause, with which we have to deal in our day.

Many causes have of late conspired to impress the minds of nearly all persons with the idea, that the Germans are more learned and profound, in all that pertains to history and philosophy at least, than the scholars of any other nation. Not only have we the great names of Otfried Müller, Niebuhr, &c., in the department of profane history criticism, but, in philosophy, we have nearly every name that awes us with its greatness, until, for very modesty's sake, we dare not question anything in which the German writers, or any considerable number of them, are represented as being agreed. Hence the inference is both easy and natural, that if any considerable proportion of German scholars are doubtful as to the credibility of the Holy Scriptures, there must be some good reason to doubt their credibility, and that reason, under the circumstances, can hardly be expected to be found anywhere else than in the departments of historic criticism or philosophy, or both combined, since in these departments alone are the Germans supposed to excel all other scholars.

But we have already said, that in the department of history or historic criticism, *nothing*, absolutely nothing has been done or obtained, which has thrown doubt upon the credibility of the Holy Scriptures, or can justly serve as a ground for scepticism. This assertion is all we can do here, but we refer to the two works of Rawlinson named at the head of our Article as proof, and assure our readers, that they will find in these books, and especially in the Lectures, abundant and most satisfactory confirmation of what we say. We speak of what has been done or obtained ; not of what has been claimed ;—that is quite a different affair—and we repeat our asser-

tion, that in what has been discovered, ascertained and settled, or even established as on the whole probable, there has been no foundation or ground found for distrust of the accuracy and credibility of the Holy Scriptures. Nor do the German Rationalists rest their Infidelity on this ground, in the last resort. Always behind and below what is properly within the range of historic criticism, there is a substratum of assumed first principles, or philosophy, which constitutes the real basis of their scepticism and rejection of the Sacred testimony. When this basis has been once adopted, and the conclusion reached and accepted, that the Bible is full of erroneous teachings, the so-called critics are very glad to avail themselves of whatever can be drawn from other sources,—whether to confirm their own minds in the opinion they have adopted, or for rhetorical effect in persuading others to adopt the same conclusion, or both, is a question which we cannot now pause to consider and answer. Doubtless there are both, mingled in different proportions, in different writers. The conclusion is abhorrent to our best hopes and instincts. We do not easily become reconciled to it; there will come longings and hopes—“desires, that the Almighty would answer, and that He had written a book”—and it is natural to seek to satisfy these misgivings and confirm the feebleness of our scepticism by collateral considerations of any kind, that have a tendency in that direction. And it is a matter of experience with all who have had anything to do with teaching and convincing others, that we often find that the reasons which produced the conviction in our own mind are not the most available and efficient in leading others to the same conclusion. Ridicule has driven many a man to infidelity, on whom even the semblance of serious argument could never have produced any such result. And so, too, on the other hand, many a man has been convinced by his feelings, and led by his heart to embrace a truth—as we will trust, to the salvation of his soul—of which, however, he could not have been convinced by any amount of sober argument, which could have been brought within the comprehension of his intellect.

We have named, at the head of our Article, the works of DeWette, on the Old and New Testament, for the two-fold



reason, that he is regarded as the most sober and moderate of the Rationalist critics, and secondly, his works have been translated and introduced into our country, by men whose names will be a commendation of the books to an important class of readers. We do not propose to go into detail in the examination of these books. With their author, as with their translator, neither the Old Testament nor the New are Books held in so much reverence, that they may not easily be charged with error, inconsistency, absurdity, and attempts to deceive and mislead the reader. The genuineness of many of the Books, which have hitherto been supposed to be the production of the men whose names they bear, as the Books of Moses, for example, is denied—and, in all cases, that inspiration which has been hitherto regarded as our guaranty against errors, whether in matters of fact or in doctrine, is conceded to no one writer in the whole Volume. The Pentateuch is ascribed to an age much later than that of Moses and the exode of the children of Israel from Egypt; they thus deprive the author, whoever he may have been, of the authority which might be ascribed to him as an honest man and an eye-witness, writing of what he had seen, and for those who had been eye-witnesses, cognizant of what he described. Passages, in books which we had regarded as prophetic, and whole books of prophecy, are represented as having been written after the event which we had supposed they were designed to foretell; and they are thus rejected, so far as we can see, chiefly, if not exclusively, because of the very fact, that they so accurately describe what they foretold.

Now it naturally occurs to us to ask how it happens, that critics of this school arrive at such results—at conclusions so diverse from what had been held and taught before? We have seen that it is not because of any discoveries, either in the Natural Sciences or in Ancient History, inconsistent with the scientific teachings and historic statements and allusions contained in the Holy Scriptures. It is not because of any *newly discovered* inconsistencies or discrepancies in the contents of the Scriptures themselves, when compared, Scripture with Scripture. But it *is* because the critics themselves start with different assumptions, different "*subjective notions*," as to what the Scriptures,

in order to be acknowledged as from God, *ought* to teach, and the way in which they *should have been* written.

The scientific student of Logic knows, that in all reasoning there are certain first principles, seldom stated, but always assumed, constituting what, in the technicalities of that science are called the Major Premises, and that most of what is called reasoning is merely an elaboration of the other or Minor Premises. These Major Premises, or first principles, are few in number comparatively, and, for the most part, they are so comprehensive and general, that they are seldom distinctly recognized or designedly urged in any argumentative production addressed to the masses of the people:—and when they are distinctly recognized and formally stated at all, they give to the discussion that characteristic which is denoted by the terms ‘abstract,’ and ‘philosophical.’ Now, the same state of facts may prove either of two directly opposite conclusions, just according as we assume one or another of these fundamental principles. Thus, if we assume that Miracles are impossible, the relation of miraculous occurrences in any book becomes proof incontrovertible, that the book is unworthy of credit. But if we start with the admission that Miracles are possible, and under certain circumstances probable, then the relation of Miracles may become to us a confirmation of a claim to a divine origin, and authority for what is said by Him Who wrought the Miracle.

Now, we state distinctly, that the reason why these Rationalistic critics arrive at conclusions so diverse from those which have been previously held, is, that they assume different principles, or Major Premises, as the ultimate grounds of their conclusions. The facts on which they reason are substantially the same as those which have always been before the minds of critics. Or, if there has been any change in these facts, effected by recent improvements in our knowledge of ancient languages and ancient history, that change is decidedly and entirely in favor of the received notions concerning the authenticity and genuineness of the Books of Holy Scripture.

One would, therefore, naturally ask, whence, then, comes this diversity of first principles, in the assumed Major Premises? We answer, as we have said, and labored to show in

several previous Articles, from what is, and what the Germans call, their Philosophy. From their philosophy they deduce certain notions concerning the character and attributes of God, the nature of Inspiration and of prophecy, the possibility or impossibility of Miracles; and whenever they find, in the writings of any author, statements or claims inconsistent with these preconceived notions, they at once infer, not that *their notions* are wrong, but that the books are spurious, or that their authors were credulous gossips, if not intentional impostors.

We propose to illustrate this assertion by a few examples, which will both exemplify and confirm what we have said. And first, in regard to Miracles. Speaking of the Book of Exodus, Parker quotes with approbation Eichhorn:

"Finally, according to the language of this Book, God produces everything directly, without availing Himself of the course of nature, and certain intermediate causes. But there is nothing peculiar to it. Its conceptions are only like those of the ancient world in general, when it had not been ascertained, by long continued inquiry, that all events are connected into a series of intermediate causes; therefore it stops with God, the ultimate cause, as if He were supposed to be the immediate cause. And even for us, who have inquired into the causes of things, the name of God in these cases is often a superfluous expletive, and no sign that God has ever interrupted the course of things."—*Vol. II. p. 32.*

Following up the same thought, the author says:

"Now, since it is at least doubtful to a cultivated mind, that *such miracles* actually took place, the question naturally arises, did they *appear* so to the eye-witnesses, and to such as were actually engaged in the events recorded in this history? or did the writer understand them as natural events, but yet portray them in a poetico-miraculous light? But this must be denied, as soon as we examine the motives somewhat more carefully; for they are entirely destitute of that credulous, poetic turn of mind, which is the key to the marvelous."—*p. 36.*

Now here is a great deal in a few words. The assumption, that we, "*who have inquired into the causes of things,*" have found that *all* events are so connected into a series of intermediate causes, that nothing can be directly ascribed to God, or have the distinctive character of a Miracle; consequently, no Miracles have been wrought. "*The cultivated mind*" cannot admit that they took place. Did then the authors who relate them so understand the matter, and speak by way of poetry and allegory? No, they were hardly up to that. Hence their books are unworthy of credit, and they were liars and impostors

Undoubtedly, the questions, 'what is a Miracle?' and 'are Miracles possible?' are grave questions, and have been gravely discussed long before this time. But it is news to us on this side the Atlantic, that '*we*,' or any body has yet so far seen into the processes of Nature, as to have found that "*all*" events are bound up in an adamant chain of intermediate causes, so that even God cannot interfere and adapt His administration of the affairs of this world to the exigencies of free will and the wants of His rational creatures. The proposition certainly has not been proved, and we are sure our readers are not prepared to make any such admission. And yet, the Rationalist assumes it. It is not merely, that they teach and maintain it as a part of their philosophy. Of that we would not complain, though of course we should differ from their opinion—but it is, that they claim it as proved, or admitted beyond doubt or further controversy—so that they assume it as the basis of their judgments and opinions concerning the accuracy and authenticity of Holy Scripture, and make it the ground of rejecting that on which all our devout hopes depend. After this, of course, we cannot expect critics of this school to admit the authenticity of any book or portion of Holy Scripture, which narrates a Miracle, or claims that one has been performed.

But, again these writers assume, as we have already said, that all ancient records are to be treated alike; and as we reject, as mythological and fabulous, much of what we find in the early writings of all other ancient nations, so we must do the same with the Hebrew Scriptures. Thus, after remarking, that the Books of Moses represent things, for the most part, as under the influence and direction of God, our author adds:

"From these condensed remarks, it must become clear, that the historical writings of the Bible are of such a character, that very few of its narratives admit of a *literal* interpretation, or one to be regarded as purely historical. But they must be considered in part as the results of theocratico-religious, or simply religious *pragmatism*," [the ascription of events to God as their cause,] and partly as mythical histories. Under these circumstances, they will not yield the historian any certain results, until historical criticism is applied to them."—p. 26.

Now, what is the reason for this conclusion, the first principles, or assumed premises from which it is derived? Simply

the author's notions of the way in which God would act, and in which the events of the early history of men and of the world must have occurred. It is in vain that we adduce facts and witnesses to disprove his theories—the theories are to him the proof that the facts are not correctly reported, and that the witnesses are conscious falsifiers, or have been tampered with. Certainly, it is fair and proper to raise these questions concerning Miracles and God's interposition in human affairs, and discuss them. If the commonly received opinions cannot stand before investigation, let them fall, for fall they will, most certainly and inevitably. But, do not assume their contradictories as tests of divine truth, while they are most woefully in need of being tested and confirmed themselves. If a man can demonstrate a new theory of motion, we will accept it, and modify all our theoretical mechanics accordingly. But, certainly, we must require him to demonstrate his theory first. We cannot allow him to assume it, just for the sake of the argument, or for the amusement of seeing what will result from its admission, and then be required to admit the conclusion, because we have allowed him to assume, for the occasion, the truth of his theory. Nay, we cannot even consent to accept his conclusions, build our plans and hopes upon them, on any mere confidence and pledge that he will, at some future time, prove his theory to our entire satisfaction. We want that proved first, and must demand the proof of it, before we can consent to give him any considerable amount of serious attention.

As still farther illustrating our general proposition, we mention the fact, that the author before us, DeWette, rejects the claims of the Book of Joshua, chiefly because, (1) the Book

"Constantly refers to Jehovah, as directing and influencing affairs, sometimes by His word, sometimes by the *sacred lot*, sometimes by an *apparition*."—p. 168.

And, (2) "To me," he says,

"There is one mark, which, *more than all others*," [the italics are ours,] "perhaps, shows the late origin of the book; that is, the frequent mention of the 'Law of Moses,' and the 'Book of the Law.'"—p. 188.

So, of course, it may appear to him. But, to us, accepting the Pentateuch as the writing of Moses, and believing it to be

true, nothing is more natural than these very facts, which, to the Rationalist, are *his* grounds for assigning the Book of Joshua to a later date, and pronouncing it, historically, unreliable in its statements.

Our author also thinks, that the Book of Judges could not have been all written by one author, because, in a part of it, (chapters xvii-xxi,)

"The Author takes a different point of view, referring the sins of the land to the want of a King."

But, assuredly, a Sacred writer might find occasion, as the Church has ever done, to present one thought in the system which he has to teach more frequently and emphatically at one time, and another at another, without proving unfaithful to his trust, or involving himself in inconsistencies which should throw discredit upon his veracity or his consistency.

The Prophets, of course, receive no very reverential consideration. Jeremiah's "humor is sad, melancholy, and depressed. His thoughts have no great elevation." Ezekiel's "adherence to the ritual and Levitical forms and ceremonies, is the cause of his want of depth and richness of mind, and his deficiency in great thoughts." Haggai, "without any inspiration, and following the principles of the common doctrine of retribution, and at the suggestion of a vulgar patriotism, chides, admonishes, and promises, with an unprophetic zeal, for the restoration of the ancient worship."

What, then, is Inspiration in the sense of these authors? It is merely that which raises the writer "above the simple narration of events;" "drawing from his own soul."—*p.* 5.; "expressing his own thoughts, demands and wishes, cares and hopes."—*p.* 350.

Now all this discloses a philosophy which lies under and behind this Infidelity; a philosophy, which holds that God does not interfere in the course of events—that there are no Miracles, no Inspiration, except the mere glow and earnestness of human emotion—that positive Institutions and ritual services even have no basis but superstition, priestcraft, or imposture, and therefore an earnest regard for such things is proof of narrowness and illiberality on the part of the writer. But, as

these things are the very essential and distinguishing marks of the system which the Sacred Writings claim to teach, if we reject these elements as absurd or impossible, we must, of course, reject the writings that claim to teach them, or any system of which they are an essential and inseparable part. And the next step will be, of course, to invent some theory of the origin and authorship of the books, consistent with our altered view of the nature of their contents.

It may be interesting to our readers to see how our author gets up his "internal evidences" of spuriousness and incredibility; but, as our Article is getting to be long, we must content ourselves with a single example. The Book of Esther is, of course, no favorite with him, and he arrives at one of his grounds for rejecting it, in this wise. We read in Esther, chap. i., verses 3, 4 and 5, as follows:

"In the third year of his reign, he made a feast unto all his princes and his servants; the power of Persia and Media, the nobles and princes of the provinces being before him; when he showed the riches of his glorious kingdom, and the honor of his excellent majesty many days, even an hundred and four-score days. And when these days were expired, the king made a feast unto all the people that were present at Shushan the palace, both unto great and small, seven days, in the court of the garden of the King's palace."

Now for the comment:

It is said, (Esther i. 4.) that Ahasuerus made a feast unto all his princes and officers, which lasted one hundred and eighty days. How could the affairs of any government,—especially an oriental despotism, where so much depends upon the magistrate—be managed, when, for a whole half year, all these magistrates were assembled at Susa? It is sometimes said, they went up by turns, each party remaining but a short time, and then giving place to new guests."—p. 340.

Well, why not? Our author merely replies, "*But of such an arrangement the text says nothing.*" No, nor was it obliged to say any thing of it. If it is possible, as a solution, it is sufficient as an answer to his objection to the credibility of the passage. But we can also remind him of another fact, "of which the *text* says nothing," though he does. He says that the feast lasted one hundred and eighty days. But the text says, "When these days—the one hundred and four-score—were expired—that is, *after* the one hundred and eighty days—the King made a feast," &c., and to whom? All his princes and officers? No, but "*unto all the people that were present in*



*Shushan the palace.*" In this way of finding objections—a method in which we create what we find,—create first, and *ad libitum*, and then find afterwards,—there is no limit to the number of difficulties and contradictions we can find, nor yet to the argumentative force we may choose to assign to them.

But let us look, for a few moments, at some criticisms on the New Testament. Our author refers to Luke, xxi., 20–24.

"And when ye shall see Jerusalem compassed with armies, then know that the desolation thereof is nigh; then let them which be in Judea flee, &c., \* \* \* \* for these be the days of vengeance, that all things which were written may be fulfilled," &c.

From this he infers, that the destruction of Jerusalem, which the passage only represents our Lord as having foretold,—had actually been accomplished, and that therefore the Gospel of St. Luke must have been written *after* that event. (New Test. p. 185.) And this is his usual way of disposing of prophetic passages. If they are at all precise, and specifically describe any event, they become to him and to critics of that class, proofs—stronger than confirmation of Holy Writ—that the passage was not a *prophecy* written or uttered before the event, but a history written afterwards. And, of course, so long as one's mind is pre-occupied with such a view of the nature of Inspiration and prophecy, no amount or kind of proof can convince him that a prophecy, properly so-called, has ever been uttered.

Our author quotes Ephesians, vi., 21–24, and Colos., iv. 7–17, in which the Apostle refers to Tychicus, by whom, probably, he sent the letter, and says, that he will give them further information about himself and his private affairs, and thus comments :

"This relation excites surprise. Such a transcription of himself is unworthy of an Apostle," [DeWette judges,] "and must, therefore, be the work of an imitator."—p. 283.

Dear readers, that is all ; the passages, if not the entire Epistles in which they occur, must be given up ; yes, and we must consent to part with them, because, forsooth, *Dr. Wilhelm Martin Leberecht De Wette*, thinks the passage not such as an Apostle, conscious of the dignity of his office, would have written. But the Dr. adds :

"The style, also, compared with that of the Epistle to the Colossians and other Pauline letters, is un-Pauline, being diffuse, loaded with parenthetic and secondary clauses, somewhat disconnected, verbose, and wanting in new thoughts."—p. 283.

St. Paul is a frequent offender against the De Wettan standard of taste and propriety; the Epistles to Timothy, both of them, and that to Titus, are "neither historically nor exegetically comprehensible." To him it seems impossible, that a man of so much inspiration, and elevation, and spirituality of thought, as St. Paul has shown in some of his writings, could have given such directions about the details of order and discipline, or attached any such importance to such things as these Epistles display. Of the Epistles to Titus, he says:

"The directions, I. 6-9, are trivial, and the argumentation against the false teachers, as well as their characterization, I. 10-16, III. 9, wholly vague; the moral rules, II. 1-10, III. 1, and seq., are superficial and trivial; the character of its contents would render the Epistle superfluous for Titus, and from I. 12, unfit for communication to the Church."—p. 298.

In commenting upon the Revelations, our author boldly takes ground as to its date in these words:

"In determining the date, a point which materially affects his whole view of the book, the critic must pay no heed to the doubtful accounts of the Fathers, regarding John's alleged banishment to Patmos, or to their opinion as to the date of the composition, but must rely on the internal grounds alone."—p. 372.

And, of course, he can make any thing of the book that may choose to make of it. In this way of dealing with the contents, date of origin, and authorship of the Books of Holy Scripture, there is no difficulty in holding to any theory; that may suit one's fancy or his lust,—any theory, we say, concerning inspiration, miracles, the nature and moral government of God, the conditions of human salvation, our obligation to positive institutions, or even the more general principles of natural theology and moral duty; we can have a theology as rational and as liberal as we please; our faith need encounter no obstacles that it cannot easily remove or overcome. But, is this submission to the Gospel and to Christ? or, is it subjecting both to the caprices of the human will, and the whims of a wayward fancy? Does it make Christians of us, or a mere human scheme of Christianity?

We have now, briefly and hastily, accomplished our task;

classified the grounds of Infidelity, and said, as we trust, enough of the general character of these grounds in each class, to show their value. In the first class, as we have said, the Department of Natural Science, nothing has been discovered, or is likely to be, that will shake our faith, if we recognize the fact, that the Bible was not designed—as all the other early systems claim to be—to teach any thing that falls within the domain of Natural Science—while yet its authors, in speaking of such things, (and they could not avoid speaking of, and alluding to them individually and by way of illustration,) must needs use the terms and phrases of the theories which were prevalent in their day. From recent investigations in Ancient History and Antiquities, all that has been discerned is confirmatory of our faith in the Holy Scriptures. And of the discrepancies in the verbal statements, to be found in several places, the most that can be said is, that they may affect, very essentially, our theory of inspiration, but not at all, unfavorably, our confidence in the good faith and the miraculous inspiration of the several writers, or our earnestness in the pursuit of that way of salvation through Christ, which they so luminously point out for our anxious hearts. The new grounds of Infidelity, then, if there are any, must be found in those fundamental principles of knowledge and assumed, first premises, under which all facts are to be examined and adjudged, and from which, in conjunction with those facts, the conclusions are to be drawn.

Now, these first principles may be all briefly referred to two classes, and characterized accordingly.

In the first place, many of them, as we have endeavored to show in this and two or three preceding Articles, on “Theodore Parker,” and “Philosophy and a Knowledge of God,” are derived directly from the philosophical systems that have been taught and received by the critics. In this we may suppose the critic to have been perfectly honest and conscientious. He accepted, as a truth of philosophy, that which had been last taught, received by many, confuted by none, though distrusted by persons, who, however deploring the results to which it might lead, could give no satisfactory philosophical reason for not accepting it. He that believes that God is material—or an incognizable substance—the one substance of all

things—or a mere aggregate of laws and principles, without personality, as well as he who believes that he has “inquired into the causes of things,” and can say, that “all events are connected into a series of intermediate causes,” so that the hand of God is not to be seen among them, and cannot be acknowledged to be there—even the mention of His Name being a mere “superfluous expletive,” in speaking of what transpires among men, none of these men, we say, can accept the Bible as it is, or as the great mass of believers have understood and accepted it. Their false philosophy is the corner-stone of their Infidelity, and may, not unlikely, in many cases prove the *ignis fatuus*, that lures and deludes them on to ruin.

But, in the second place, there is an “evil heart of unbelief,” full of, and always ready to suggest, these first principles of unbelief. We most heartily and firmly believe in the certain depravity of the human heart. We as freely believe, that many of its instinctive principles and sentiments are shaped and determined by that depravity. Hence, multitudes, without any study of philosophy, and without any knowledge of the systems that have been taught, are led by the inborn instincts of their own hearts to be more of philosophers, as that word is understood among men, than they are aware, and they are often found agreeing and coinciding exactly with those in whom they would have least expected to find any sympathy or agreement with themselves.

And for these reasons, and we assure our readers that there are no others—the teachings of a false philosophy, and the suggestions of a corrupt heart,—we are called upon to renounce the Bible, the anchor of our hopes, add one more to the incomprehensible mysteries of the universe, make the darkness of nature still darker, confusion worse confounded, and erect the very evil which God’s word was given us to cure, into a bulwark of defence against its reception! The teachings of philosophy, if false, must be met and counteracted by its own weapons. But a corrupt heart, the Spirit of God is powerful to convert that. And as we wade through the huge volumes which German scepticism has produced, we are astonished, at every page, to see how a little leaven—and how little of it—can leaven the whole lump, convert the whole mass of historic

fact and legitimate criticism—if we will but admit the few slyly insinuated principles—into an inexhaustible magazine of unbelief. It makes everything look as though the Bible is but the boldest of impostures, and none but fools could ever have regarded it as in any important sense the word of God. But it is something to know, that the whole difficulty lies in “the subjective notions” which these critics themselves bring to their task. In the omniscience of this critical infallibility, they have no hesitation in repudiating what they cannot see any use for, and in declaring to be spurious, whatever is not as they had expected to find it. Believing their own Reason to be nothing else than God Himself, they very naturally enter upon their work with the impression, that they, through this means, know more of God than they have any right to expect to learn from the books they have to examine; they go to them, not for information, but to inform their authors; not to learn, but to teach; not to receive light, but to give it. And we really believe, that what both the critics and those who are led away by them need, is not so much argument and instruction, as exhortation to repentance. A little humility and self-distrust would do them an immense deal of good. But for the rest, for us who are set for the defence of the Gospel, we shall lose all fears and anxieties, we trust, when we consider, as we have attempted to show in this Article, that their unbelief has no other or better foundation, in reality, than the mere presumptive sentiments of human depravity, or the utterances of a philosophy which is at war with all the clearest dictates of common sense, as well as all the experience of actual life. With this we feel content to dismiss the subject to such as have time and leisure to amuse or delude themselves with it, as the case may be, and go on in our work of preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ to a world perishing in sin—a world that cares very little for philosophy and vain theists—but which is most painfully in earnest to know what to do, that they may be saved. Faith, Repentance, Obedience—these will cure and quiet the heart here: philosophy may be learned and mysteries comprehended, if need be, in another world.

## ART. II.—INTERESTING AND CURIOUS FACTS ABOUT BISHOPS; BEING “DOTTINGS OF DESULTORY READING.”

“I entered a memorandum in my pocket-book.”—*Guardian*.

“Old fashioned economists will tell you never to pass an old nail, or an old horse-shoe, or buckle, or even a pin, without taking it up; because, although you may not want it now, you will find a use for it sometime or other. I say the same thing to you with regard to knowledge. However useless it may appear to you, at the moment, seize upon all that is fairly within your reach. For there is not a fact, within the whole circle of human observation, nor even a fugitive anecdote, that you read in a newspaper, or hear in conversation, that will not come into play sometime or other: and occasions will arise when they will, involuntarily, present their dim shadows in the train of your thinking and reasoning, as belonging to that train, and you will regret that you cannot recall them more distinctly.”

WILLIAM WIRT.

The interesting coincidence of the intrusting, for a second time, of the two most important and influential of our Dioceses, to the Episcopal oversight of two brothers, first the Onderdonks and then the Potters, for which office also, two other brothers, the Vintons<sup>a</sup>, were candidates, will render acceptable to our readers the following “desultory dottings” concerning like facts in other times, all of which may be added, in some sort, to our “Curiosities in Literature.” A small portion of this Article appeared in the “*Banner of the Cross*,” some years ago, from the pen of the present writer, with the addition of a contribution of the same kind, with which he was honored by one of our present Bishops.

### I.—BROTHERS IN THE EPISCOPATE.

We need not here mention the relationships in the original Apostolate, being better known than the like among the Successors of the Twelve.

1. Gregory Nyssen, of Cappadocia, was the younger brother of the famous St. Basil, Archbishop of Cesarea, A. D., 372.

<sup>a</sup> The Rev. Dr. Hawks, brother of the Bishop of Missouri, has been elected Bishop once or twice, but declined.



He is said to have made that recension of the Nicene Creed, in the General Council of Constantinople, afterwards universally adopted, and now used.

2. St. Chad, Bishop of Lichfield, (A. D. 667,) the Saxon Saint, whose memory is duly honored by the beautiful Cathedral at Lichfield, was a brother of Cedd, or Ceadda, Bishop (A. D., 658,) of London, or the East Angles. On occasion of St. Chad's consecration by Wina, Bishop of Wessex, we find the first act of communion between the British and Anglo-Saxon Churches, two Welsh Bishops having assisted in the consecration. Beside a brother in the Episcopate, St. Chad had also two other brothers, celebrated Priests.

3. St. Melus, a nephew of St. Patrick, and Bishop of Ardagh, (A. D., 454,) had a brother, Senach, or Secundin, Bishop of Dunshaghlín, now Meath. This was formerly an Arch-Episcopal See, in token of which the Bishops of Meath have always been accorded the title, "Most Reverend," to this day.

4. St. Melucho, or Melchus, another brother of the preceding, was his successor in the See of Ardagh, (A. D., 488.)

5. Seffridius, of Chichester, (A. D., 1125,) had the happiness of seeing a brother in the Episcopate, and of consecrating him with his own hands; that brother afterwards becoming Archbishop of Canterbury.

6. Gilbert Foliot, (A. D., 1148,) Bishop of Hereford, and afterwards of London, who made an attempt to recover to his See of London its ancient metropolitical dignity, had a brother, Robert Foliot, who succeeded him in the See of Hereford, in A. D., 1174, and afterwards had a nephew in the same See.

7. Christian O'Morgair, Bishop of Clogher, (A. D., 1126,) was brother of Malachi O'Morgair, Archbishop of Armagh, (A. D., 1134,) "*vir literatus et discretus.*"

8. Isidore Hispalensis succeeded his brother Leander, as Bishop of Seville, (A. D., 595,) and had another brother, Fulgentius, Bishop of Carthage. This Isidore must be distinguished from Isidore, Bishop of Corduba, (A. D., 425,) and from Isidore, of Pelusium, (A. D., 412,) with whom he is often confounded; and this Fulgentius must be distinguished from another of the same name, who was born at Carthage, and was Bishop of Ruspe, in Africa, not long before the other flourish-



ed in Spain. The African Bishop was one of the most learned, pious and influential theologians of his day, and specially wrote on the doctrines of grace, against the Arians and Pelagians.

9. Salonius, and Veranius, both sons of a Bishop, (A. D., 450,) were in the Gallic Episcopate, the former of Lyons, in which he succeeded his father.

10. Polychronius, Bishop of Apamea, (A. D., 420,) was brother of the heretical Bishop Theodore, of Mopsuestia. These were expositors of Sacred Scripture, who would not follow the interpretations of their predecessors without a good reason.

11. Walter de Jorse, (A. D., 1306,) Primate of Armagh, had a brother, Thomas de Jorse, a Cardinal Bishop, and another brother, Roland de Jorse, was his successor in the See of Armagh, (A. D., 1311.)

12. Maurice M'Carwill, (A. D., 1306,) Archbishop of Cashel, was brother of John M'Carwill, Bishop of Cork, (A. D., 1302.)

13. Alexander Lawater, or Lauder, of Dunkeld, (A. D., 1440,) was brother of the Bishop of Glasgow, William Lauder, who died A. D., 1425.

14. James Stewart, of Moray, (A. D., 1459,) was brother of David Stewart, his successor in this Bishopric. The latter built the great tower of Spynie Castle, "a mighty strong house," called, to this day, David's Tower.

15. Patrick Graham, Bishop of St. Andrew's, (A. D., 1466,) was step-brother and successor of Bishop James Kennedy, a prelate who rendered himself no less illustrious by his virtues, than he was by his noble birth; the king, James III., addressed him as "*avunculo nostro carissimo.*"

16. James Chisholm, of Dunblane, (A. D., 1486,) was brother of his successor, William Chisholm, (A. D., 1527,) who himself was succeeded by a nephew of the same name.

17. Campeggio, (Lorenzo,) the famous Cardinal Bishop, (A. D., 1512,) had a brother Thomas, a Bishop. The Cardinal was legate of Clement VII. to the German princes in the matter of Luther. He was Bishop of Salisbury, Eng., in 1524, and a learned Canonist, employed by King Henry VIII. in the matter of his divorce.

18. Peter Paul Vergerio, (A. D., 1545,) Bishop of Capo d'Istria, and Nuncio of the Pope, had a brother in the Episcopate, who with him went over to the Reformation.

19. John Hamilton, (A. D., 1545,) Bishop of Dunkeld, was a brother of James Hamilton, Bishop of Argyle, (A. D., 1548,) who sided with the Reformation.

20. John, and Olaus Magnus, of Sweden, the two last Papal Archbishops of Upsala, the former from 1533 to 1544, the latter from 1545 to 1588, were brothers, papal legates, exiles from their See, writers of historic works, and both buried in the church of St. Peter, at Rome.

21. Michael Boyle, Bishop of Waterford and Lismore, (A. D., 1619,) and Richard Boyle, Bishop of Cork and Cloyne, (A. D., 1620,) and Archbishop of Tuam, (A. D., 1638,) were brothers, the latter of whom had a son in the Episcopate, who succeeded him in the See of Cork.

22. George Abbot, Bishop of Lichfield, (A. D., 1609,) Bishop of London, (A. D., 1610,) Archbishop of Canterbury, (A. D., 1611,) was an elder brother of Robert Abbot, and consecrated him to the See of Sarum, in 1615. He preceded Archbishop Laud, in the chief See, but was different in character and government, being over-remiss in discipline, of Puritan tendencies, and accustomed to browbeat the inferior Clergy, while he was taxed with unfriendliness to those of his own function.

23. Peter Walenburg, and Adrian Von Walenburg, (about A. D., 1660,) were brothers, born at Rotterdam, and who lived at Cologne; the first was Bishop of Mysia *in partibus*, the other was Bishop of Adrianople *in partibus*,\* and Suffragan to Mayence.

24. Hon. James Talbot, (A. D., 1758,) "Vicar Apostolic"\*

---

\* Papal Bishops, holding foreign Sees *in partibus infidelium*, and "Vicars Apostolic" of the same grade, are appointed by the Bishop of Rome as his agents, whose commissions are revokable at his will. Through them the Pope has acted in England, since the Reformation, as its *quasi*-Bishop, until lately, when, commissioning them as Bishops in ordinary, he gives up his personal Episcopal jurisdiction over Englishmen, holding these Bishops, in ordinary, as responsible to him as before.

Though not allowed by government to assume the titles of English Sees, they create others, assuming the name of some extinct Episcopate, as, *e. g.*, Chalcis, Adrumede,

in England, was brother of the Hon. T. Talbot, "Vicar Apostolic," (A. D., 1766.)

25. William Sheridan, (A. D., 1681,) Bishop of Ardagh and Kilmore, was a brother of Patrick Sheridan, Bishop of Cloyne, (A. D., 1679.)

26. James Rose, of Glasgow, (A. D., 1726,) was brother of the deprived prelate, Alexander Rose, Bishop of Moray, (A. D., 1687,) and who (from A. D., 1687 to 1719,) presided over the See of Edinburg, and over the whole Scottish Church. This latter prelate outlived all his brethren, and all the English Bishops likewise, who had been possessed of Sees before the Revolution. He studied divinity under Dr. Gilbert Burnet, at Glasgow, afterwards Bishop of Salisbury, in England.

27. The Drs. Gibson, William and ———, both of the Roman intrusion in England, and "Vicars Apostolic," the elder in 1780, and the younger brother in 1790, are little known, as having made no mark.

28. Benjamin Hoadly, Bishop of Bangor, (A. D., 1715,) of Hereford, (A. D., 1723,) of Sarum, (A. D., 1723,) and of Winchester, (from A. D., 1734 to 1761,) was brother of John Hoadly, Bishop of Eghlin, (A. D., 1727,) Archbishop of Dublin, (from A. D., 1729 to 1742,) and of Armagh, (until A. D., 1747.) The former is well known as eminent for talents and eloquence, but who greatly lowered the authority and dignity of the Church.

29. William Cleaver, of Chester, (A. D., 1787,) of Bangor, (from A. D., 1800 till 1806,) and of E. Asaph, (till 1815,) was the brother of Euseby Cleaver, (A. D., 1789–1809,) Bishop of Ferns and Leighlin, and Archbishop of Dublin, (A. D., 1809–1820.

---

Amosia, Melipotamus, &c., and thus they are *titular Bishops of Dioceses which they have never visited*. They are lieutenants and Vicars of an Italian Bishop, sacrificing their ancient dignity as "Vicars of Christ," while intruding into the Sees of our Bishops who are *Vicarii Filii Dei*, and equals of the Bishop of Rome. The practical effect of their appointment in England, as elsewhere in *partibus infidelium*, is a practical insult to the nation and the Church; a public declaration that the English Church is no Church at all; invalidates all its acts, and transfers the Primacy of Canterbury to the Bishop of Rome, as universal head.

30. John Geo. Beresford, (A. D., 1805-1819,) Bishop of Derry and Raphoe, from 1819 till 1822, Archbishop of Dublin, and from 1822 till the present, Primate of Armagh, had a brother in the Episcopate, in Geo. de la Poer Beresford, Bishop of Kilmore, (A. D., 1802-1819 ;) both of whom were sons of a Bishop, and uncles of a Bishop.

31. George Henry Law, (A. D., 1812-1823,) Bishop of Chester, was a brother of John Law, (A. D., 1795-1810,) Bishop of Elphin ; and both sons of Bishop Edmund Law, of Carlisle, (A. D., 1769-1787.)

32. Edward Synge, (A. D., 1731-3,) Bishop of Cloyne, and Nicholas Synge, (A. D., 1746-1771,) were brothers, sons of a Bishop, and grandsons of a Bishop.

33. John Bird Sumner, present Archbishop of Canterbury, consecrated in 1828 as Bishop of Chester, is brother to Charles Richard Sumner, Bishop of Winchester, who was consecrated to the See of Llandaff, in 1826.\*

34. Benjamin Tredwell Onderdonk, the late Bishop of New York, (from A. D., 1830-1861,) and the late Henry Ustick Onderdonk, of Pennsylvania, (from A. D., 1827-1858,) were brothers, the latter of whom united in the consecration of the former ; whose mother lived to see them in the Episcopate.

35. Alonzo Potter, the present Bishop of Pennsylvania, (consecrated in A. D., 1845,) and Horatio Potter, Bishop of New York, (consecrated in 1854,) are also brothers, the former assisting in the consecration of the latter.

36. Francis N. Blanchet, Romish Archbishop of Oregon City, is a brother of Magloire Blanchet, Romish Bishop of Nesqually, the former consecrated in 1845, and the latter in 1846.

37. George Trevor Spencer, consecrated in 1837, late Bishop of Madras ; is he not brother of Aubrey George Spencer, (consecrated A. D., 1839, for New Foundland,) and transferred to Jamaica, in 1843 ?

---

\* "Mrs. Sumner lived to see her two sons raised to the Episcopal bench ; she died a short time before the Archbishop was elevated to the See of Canterbury."—*Bishop David Anderson's private letter.*

38. Francis Patrick Kenrick, consecrated 1830, for the Romish See of Philadelphia, now, since 1851, Metropolitan and Papal Archbishop of Baltimore, is brother of Peter Richard Kenrick, Romish Archbishop of St. Louis, consecrated in 1841.

## II.—FATHER AND SON IN THE EPISCOPATE.

1. Pope Theodore I., of the See of Rome, (A. D., 642,) was the legitimate son of a Bishop.

2. Pope Hormisdas, of the same See, (A. D., 514,) was father, in marriage, of Sylverius, Pope from A. D., 536–538.

3. Pope Innocent is said by St. Jerome to have been the son of his predecessor, Anastasius. His expression is “*qui Apostolicæ Cathedræ et supradicti viri successor et filius est.*”

Milman asks if this is to be viewed as an incautious figure?

4. The famous Gregory Nazianzen, (A. D., 370,) a friend of the great St. Basil, was son of a Bishop of the same name, and succeeded his father in his See of Nazianzum, in Cappadocia.

5. Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons, (A. D., 434,) had two sons, Salonius and Veranius, who were Bishops. Among the most admired works of the father is his “Instructions to his sons,” a work on the pastoral office.

6. Sampson, of Bayon, or Baieux, in Normandy, Bishop of Worcester, (A. D., 1097,) was father of Thomas, Archbishop of York, (A. D., 1109.)

7. Richard Peckett, or Peche, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, (A. D., 1162,) was son of Robert Peckett, Bishop of the same Diocese, (A. D., 1121,) or, as styled by Collier, Bishop of Chester. The See of Lichfield was (in A. D., 1075) transferred to Chester; but before the accession of Robert Peche, it was removed to Coventry.

8. Andrew Knox, (A. D., 1606,) Bishop of the Isles, and afterwards of Raphoe, Ireland, was succeeded in the Bishopric of the Isles by his son, Thomas Knox, (A. D., 1622.)

9. Neil Campbell, (A. D., 1580,) and John Campbell, (A. D., 1608,) Bishops of Argyle, were father and son. When all the other Bishops were lampooned in a satirical poem, and taxed with immoralities, (though falsely,) yet such was the unusual

good character of the former prelate, even among those who hated the Episcopacy, that he alone is excepted; on the contrary, the author of that angry and insolent satire says of him, "*Solus in Ergadiis præsul meritissimus oris.*"

10. John King, (A. D., 1611,) Bishop of London, was father of Henry King, Bishop of Chichester, (A. D., 1641-1669.) King James used to style the former "the king of preachers, as well as the preacher of the king;" and Lord Coke often said, that he was the best speaker of the Star chamber in his day.

It was charged on him, after his death, by one Fisher, *alias* Musquet, a Romanist, that he died in the communion of Rome; but the falsehood was exposed by the Bishop's son, in a sermon preached at St. Paul's Cross, and by Godwin, *de Præsulibus Angliæ*.

11. Francis Godwin, Bishop of Llandaff, (A. D., 1601,) and of Hereford, (A. D., 1617,) author of the work "*De Præsulibus Angliæ Commentarius*," in which he gives accounts of all the Anglican Bishops down to his day, was son of Thomas Godwin, Bishop of Bath and Wells, (A. D., 1584.) He was a considerable mathematician, a good preacher, an eminent antiquary, and wrote well in Latin.

12. William Downham, Bishop of Chester, (A. D., 1561-1579,) was the father of George Downham, Bishop of Derry, A. D., 1616.)

13. John Bridgman, Bishop of Chester, (A. D., 1619-1652,) was father of Henry Bridgman, Bishop (A. D., 1671-82,) of Sodor and Man.

14. Joseph Hall, Bishop of Exeter, (A. D., 1627-41,) and then of Norwich, (till 1656,) author of the work, "The Divine Right of Episcopacy," &c., was the father of George Hall, Bishop of Chester, A. D., 1662-1668.)

15. Edward Parry, (A. D., 1647,) Bishop of Killaloe, was father of John Parry, Bishop of Ossory, (A. D., 1672-1677.)

16. Michael Boyle, Archbishop of Armagh, (A. D., 1678,) was son of Richard Boyle, Bishop of Cork, (A. D., 1620,) and afterwards Archbishop of Tuam, (A. D., 1638 to 1641,) who himself was brother of the Bishop of Waterford, (A. D., 1619-1636.)

17. John Paterson, (A. D., 1662,) Bishop of Ross, was fa-

ther of Archbishop John Paterson, of Glasgow, (A. D., 1687.) The latter was first made Bishop of Galloway, then advanced to the Bishopric of Edinburg, (A. D., 1679,) and subsequently preferred to Glasgow; next year, (A. D., 1688,) he was deprived by the Revolution, and died (A. D., 1708,) in Edinburg. Both father and son were invested with the sacred character of the Episcopacy at the same time.

18. Essex Digby, Bishop of Dromore, (A. D., 1670,) was father of Simon Digby, Bishop of Limerick, (A. D., 1678,) and of Elphin, (A. D., 1692–1720.)

19. John Vesey, Archbishop of Tuam, (A. D., 1678–1716,) was father of Sir Thomas Vesey, Bishop of Killaloe, (A. D., 1714,) and of Ossory, (from A. D., 1714–1731.) The Bishopric of Tuam was established early in the sixth century, and made an Archbishopric in A. D., 1152.

20. Gilbert Ironside, (A. D., 1661,) of Bristol, was father of another Gilbert Ironside, Bishop of the same See, (A. D., 1689,) and of Hereford, (A. D., 1691–1700.)

21. Henry Egerton, (A. D., 1723,) Bishop of Hereford, was father of John Egerton, (A. D., 1756,) Bishop of Bangor, then (A. D., 1768,) of Lichfield and Coventry; and afterwards (A. D., 1771–87,) of Durham.

22. Charles Moss, (A. D., 1766,) of St. David's, and (in A. D., 1777,) of Bath and Wells, was father of Charles Moss, (A. D., 1807–1812,) of Oxford.

23. Edmund Law, (A. D., 1769,) Bishop of Carlisle, was father of George Henry Law, (in A. D., 1812,) Bishop of Chester, and (A. D., 1824–1845,) of Bath and Wells.

24. John Law, (A. D., 1782,) Bishop of Clonfert, in 1787 of Killaloe, and of Elphin in 1795, was a son of Bishop Edmund Law.

25. Lord George Murray, (A. D., 1800,) Bishop of St. David's, was father of Dr. George Murray, in 1813 Bishop of Sodor and Man, and at present, since 1827, Bishop of Rochester.

26. Robert Gray, (A. D., 1827,) of Bristol, was father, as I am assured, of Robert Gray, 1847, consecrated Bishop of Cape Town.



27. Edward Synge,\* (A. D., 1716,) Archbishop of Tuam, was son of Edward Synge, (A. D., 1660-3,) Bishop of Limerick.

28. The same Archbishop of Tuam was also father of Nicholas Synge, (A. D., 1746,) Bishop of Killaloe, and of Edward Synge, (A. D., 1731,) Bishop of Cloyne.

29. John Skinner, (A. D., 1782,) Primus of Scotland, to whom we are indebted, under God, for our first American Bishop, was father of William Skinner, who succeeded him in the See of Aberdeen in 1816.

30. William Beresford, (A. D., 1780-82,) Bishop of Down, was father of Bishop John George Beresford, present Archbishop of Armagh, and of George de la Poer Beresford, (A. D., 1802-19,) Bishop of Kilmore, whose nephew succeeded him in 1854.

31. Charles Inglis, Bishop of Nova Scotia, who died in 1816, formerly Rector of Trinity Church, N. Y., and who was consecrated in A. D., 1787, was father of John Inglis, the third Bishop of the same See, (from 1825 to 1849,) and both natives of New York.

32. George Jehoshaphat Mountain,† present Bishop of Quebec, consecrated in 1836, formerly Bishop of Montreal, is a son of Jacob Mountain, Bishop of Quebec and Montreal, who died in 1839; and both are descended from George Mountain, Bishop of Lincoln, (A. D., 1617-20.)

### III.—UNCLES AND NEPHEWS IN THE EPISCOPATE.

1. St. Martin, the holy Bishop of Tours, was uncle of the renowned St. Patrick, and admitted him to the Diaconate, (A. D., 431.)

2. St. Patrick's nephew, St. Secundinus, was Bishop of Dunshaglin, or Donseachlin, in Meath, (A. D., 490.)

---

\* "In Ireland it was not a rare thing, for Bishops of the same family to be made, and none were more honored than the name of SYNGE; and in England, aforesaid, it seemed to be conveyed in families more than it is now, probably because learning was more confined to wealthy families."

† It is only the simple truth to state, that no family has supplied more faithful laborers to the Colonial Church, in numerous offices of dignity and trust, than the family of Mountain.

3. Dunstan, (A. D., 959,) Archbishop of Canterbury, was nephew of the severe Odo, and some say also of Aldhelm, but rather more correctly, of Elphege, Bishop of Winchester, (A. D., 935.)

4. Eleutherius, Bishop of the West Saxons, (A. D., 635,) was nephew of Agilbert, Bishop of Dorchester, near Oxford.

5. St. Patrick's nephew, Melus, and another nephew, Tigrid, were Bishops, the former of Ardagh, (in A. D., 454,) and the latter of Athrum, now Trim, in Meath.

6. The famous St. Ninian, (A. D., 452,) was nephew of St. Martin, of Tours, and was educated by him. The Bishopric of Galloway was founded by St. Ninian, who also built a church of white marble, in honor of St. Martin.

7. Frederick, of Devonshire, (A. D., 832,) Bishop of Utrecht, was nephew of Winfred, otherwise called Boniface, the first Archbishop of Mentz, "the Apostle of Germany."

8. Alexander, Bishop of Lincoln, (A. D., 1123,) was nephew of Roger, Bishop of Salisbury, both of whom were imprisoned by king Stephen, for mercenary reasons on his part.

9. Pope Clement IV., (A. D., 1265,) a married priest, was made Pope after he became widowed, and had a nephew who also reached the tiara.

10. Hugh Foliot, (A. D., 1219,) Bishop of Hereford, was nephew of Gilbert, and of Robert Foliot, who were his predecessors in the same See, (A. D., 1148, and A. D., 1174.)

11. Robert Wiseheart, nephew of William Wiseheart, (A. D., 1272,) succeeded his uncle in the See of Glasgow. "When the war broke out, by reason of the encroachments King Edward I. of England made upon the honor and independence of Scotland, no man did more vigorously withstand the tyranny, than this prelate, Robert Wiseheart."

12. Walter Wardlaw, (A. D., 1368,) of Glasgow, and Cardinal, was uncle of Henry Wardlaw, Bishop of St. Andrew's, (A. D., 1404.)

13. Donald Macnaughton, Bishop of Dunkeld, (elected A. D., 1436,) was nephew of his predecessor, Robert de Cairney, (A. D., 1396,) who dared to resist the Pope's interference in matters of the See of Dunkeld.

14. James Stewart, (A. D., 1497,) Archbishop of St. An-

drew's, was uncle of Alex. Stewart, his successor, in 1509. "The See was kept vacant for the nephew six years; the young Archbishop was almost adored for his temper, learning, accomplishments, and birth; being of the royal blood of the Stuarts."

15. James Hepburn, (A. D., 1516,) of Moray, was uncle of Patrick Hepburn, Bishop in 1535 of the same See.

16. Gavin Dunbar, (A. D., 1518,) of Aberdeen, was uncle of Gavin Dunbar, Archbishop of Glasgow.

17. John Voysey, (A. D., 1519,) Bishop of Exeter, was uncle of John Voysey, his successor in the same See, in 1553.

18. David Beaton, or Bethune, (A. D., 1539,) Archbishop of St. Andrew's, Apostolic legate and Cardinal, was nephew of James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow, (A. D., 1522,) and afterwards of St. Andrew's. "He was the Wolsey of Scotland, the impersonation of the faults of his age, and the virtues of his Order." With David Beatoun, who died in 1603, the old line of the Scottish Episcopate came to an end.

19. George Crichton, (A. D., 1527,) Bishop of Dunkeld, was uncle of Robert Crichton, of the same See, in 1550.

20. Rowland Merrick, (A. D., 1559,) Bishop of Bangor, was uncle of John Merrick, Bishop of Sodor, in 1576. "In St. Mary's Church, Pembroke, is this monumental record of one of his family, still preserved and showed to visitors: 'Mawde Merrick, daughter to John Merik and Luce his wyeffe, was borne and buried the 21 of February, 1606.'"

21. William Chisholm, (A. D., 1567,) of Dunblane, was nephew of two Bishops Chisholm, who, from 1486 to 1564, occupied the same See of Dunblane. The nephew was first constituted coadjutor to his uncle William Chisholm; then succeeded him; and afterwards was made Bishop of Vaison, in France, and, in his old age, died a Carthusian, at Grenoble.

22. Henry Usher, (A. D., 1595-1613,) Archbishop of Armagh, was paternal uncle of the renowned Archbishop James Usher, (A. D., 1620,) who was brought forward by Archbishop Laud, and ordered Deacon by his uncle.

23. David Lindsay, (A. D., 1604,) of Ross and Glasgow, was uncle of his successor, (A. D., 1613,) in the See of Ross,

Patrick Lindsay, afterwards also Archbishop of Glasgow. The former, assisted by the latter, was the celebrant of the baptism of Charles I. of England.

24. John Guthrie, Bishop of Moray, (A. D., 1623,) was uncle of Bishop Wood, of Caithness, in 1690.

25. The good Bishop Thomas Wilson, (A. D., 1698,) of Sodor and Man, was maternal nephew of the renowned Bishop Sherlock, and, through his wife, traced his descent from the devout Bishop William de Waynfleet, the magnificent founder of Magdalen College, Oxford.

26. John Bancroft, (A. D., 1632,) of Oxford, was nephew of Dr. Richard Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, in 1604.

27. George Morley, (A. D., 1660,) Bishop of Worcester, and afterwards, (in 1662,) of Winchester, was uncle of the famous Bishop Thomas Kenn, (A. D., 1685,) of Bath and Wells.

28. Dr. Frederick Cornwallis, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, (A. D., 1749,) and Archbishop of Canterbury in 1768, was uncle of James Cornwallis, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, from 1781 to 1824. These dignitaries were of the noble family of Cornwallis, one of whom commanded the British Army during the war of Independence.

29. Lewis Bagot, (A. D., 1782,) of Bristol, in 1783 of Norwich, and in 1790 of St. Asaph, was uncle of Bishop Richard Bagot, of Oxford, in 1829, and who, from 1845 to 1854, was Bishop of Bath and Wells.

30. Hon. Edmund Knox, Bishop of Limerick, (A. D., 1836,) was uncle of Robert Knox, the present Bishop of Down, Connor, and Dromore, who was consecrated in 1849.

31. Marcus G. Beresford, Bishop of Kilmore, Elphin and Ardagh, consecrated in 1854, is the nephew of John George Beresford, the present Primate of Ireland, and son of George de la Poer Beresford, Bishop (from 1802 to 1829) of Kilmore, and also grandson of Bishop William Beresford, of Dromore, (A. D., 1780-2.)

32. "A singular arrangement has existed for a long period among the Nestorians, inasmuch as its Patriarchate is made to descend from uncle to nephew; or, where there is no nephew, to a younger brother, qualifications being respected."

#### IV.—OTHER KIN IN THE EPISCOPATE.

1. Felix IV., Pope of Rome, (A. D., 526–9,) was grandfather to Gregory the Great, (A. D., 590.)

2. Pope Gregory the Great, according to other accounts, had, as an ancestor in the fourth degree, Felix II., (A. D., 355,) an intruding Pope, whose name is inserted in some catalogues, but omitted by St. Augustine, and others. At this early period it was common for the Bishops of Rome to be, like other Bishops, and their own St. Peter, married men. Celibacy is a disciplinary restriction.

3. The Bishopric Vladika, of the Church in Montenegro, which is filled by appointment of the Czar of Russia, and of which the consecration takes place at St. Petersburg, must always be of the family of Petrovich.

4. William de Tulloch, (A. D., 1470,) of Orkney and Moray, was cousin of Thomas de Tulloch, who was in the See of the Orkneys in the reign of James III., having obtained the administration of these Isles from Eric, king of Denmark, in 1422.

5. The McBrady family gave several Bishops to the Church; Ware reckons five of Kilmore, viz: Roderick, in A. D., 1396; Nicholas, in 1420; Andrew, in 1454; Thomas, in 1489; John, in 1576; one of Ardagh, viz: Gilbert, in 1396; one of Meath, viz: Hugh, in 1563—the last taking part in the Reformation, and nominated by Queen Elizabeth.

6. Archbishop John Tillotson, (A. D., 1690,) of Canterbury, married the step-daughter of Bishop John Wilkins, of Chester, (A. D., 1669–73.)

7. Richard Terrick, 1758, of Peterborough, and of London, in 1776, (our Diocesan at the Revolution of these Colonies,) was the maternal grand-father of Henry Ryder, 1815, Bishop of Gloucester, and in 1836, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry.

8. Laurentius Petri, (A. D., 1531,) Archbishop of Upsala, at the head of its Reformation, aged 32 at the time of his consecration, and 42 years in the Episcopate, was father-in-law of Laurentius Petri, surnamed *Gothus*, his successor (A. D., 1573,) in the same Archi-Episcopal See.

9. William Barlow, (A. D., 1535,) Bishop of St. Asaph, then (in 1536) of St. David's, in 1548 of Bath and Wells, and

of Chichester in 1559, had, as sons-in-law, by marriage to five daughters, as many Bishops, viz: William Overton, 1580, Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry; William Wickham, 1584, of Lincoln, and in 1595, of Winchester; Herbert Westfaling, 1585, of Hereford; William Day, 1595, successor to his brother Wickham, in the See of Winchester; and Tobias Matthew, 1595, of Durham, and in 1606, Archbishop of York. In 1595, these five Bishops were on the Episcopal bench together, and all sons, by marriage, of a Bishop—a fact which, doubtless, never has had a parallel.

10. Sir Jonathan Trelawney, 1685, Bishop of Bristol, in 1689, of Exeter, and in 1707, of Winchester, was maternal grand-father of William Buller, in 1792, Bishop of Exeter.

11. The same Bishop Buller was son-in-law of John Thomas, in 1748, Bishop of Peterborough, in 1757, of Salisbury, and in 1761, of Winchester.

12. Sir Thomas Gooch, (A. D., 1737,) Bishop of Bristol, then, in 1738, of Norwich, and in 1748, of Ely, was brother-in-law of Bishop Thomas Sherlock, of Bangor, in 1727, of Salisbury, in 1734, and of London, in 1749; the author of the celebrated "Discourses preached at the Temple Church." This was the prelate who, in 1753, ordained young Seabury.

13. Thomas Secker, 1734, Bishop of Bristol, in 1737, of Oxford, and in 1758, Archbishop of Canterbury, was brother-in-law of Martin Benson, Bishop of Gloucester, in 1734.

14. Richard Cumberland, 1691, of Peterborough, was grand-father of Dennis Cumberland, Bishop of Kilmore, in 1772, and of Clonfert and Kilmacduagh.

15. Francis Godwin, author of "*De Præsulibus Angliæ*," Bishop of Llandaff, in 1601, and of Hereford, in 1617, was son-in-law of Bishop John Walton, or Woolton, of Exeter, (A. D., 1579–94,) who must not be confounded with Dr. Brian Walton, author of the Polyglott. He lived about A. D., 1657.

16. Robert Tounson, 1620, of Salisbury, was brother-in-law of his successor, Bishop John Davenant, (1621–41,) and both uncles of Thomas Fuller, the quaint Church Historian.

17. George Vaus, or Vans, (1489–1505,) Bishop of Galloway, was cousin-german to Alexander Vaus, of the same See, (1426–1450.) Boethius calls the latter, "*Vir nobilis et eruditus*."



18. Thomas Jones, 1584, of Meath, and in 1605, Archbishop of Dublin, was brother-in-law of his predecessor in the Primacy, Adam Loftus, who was in this See from 1567 to 1605.

19. Robert (or *Henry*, as some have it) Echlin, (A. D., 1613–35,) Bishop of Down and Connor, was father-in-law of Robert Maxwell, (1643–72,) of Kilmore.

20. Jeremy Taylor, author of the “Holy Living and Dying,” Bishop of Down, Connor and Dromore, in 1661, was father-in-law of Francis Marsh, Bishop of Limerick, in 1667, of Kilmore, in 1672, and in 1681, Archbishop of Dublin.

21. Welbore Ellis, (A. D., 1731,) of Meath, was maternal grand-father of Charles Agar, Bishop of Cloyne, in 1768, Archbishop of Cashel, in 1779, and in 1803, Archbishop of Dublin and Earl of Normanton.

22. George Murray, from 1813–27, of Sodor and Man, and from 1827 to the present, Bishop of Rochester, married the grand-daughter of Robert Hay Drummond, 1748, Bishop of St. Asaph; in 1761, for a few weeks only, Bishop of Sarum, and from 1761 to 1776, Archbishop of York.

23. Jonathan Shipley, (A. D., 1769–89,) Bishop of St. Asaph, before which, in 1769, for a few weeks, Bishop of Llandaff, was grand-father of the wife of Bishop Heber, of Calcutta, (1823–25.)

24. Richard Channing Moore, (1814–41,) of Virginia, was grand-uncle of Gregory Thurston Bedell, present Assistant Bishop of Ohio, and ordered him both to the Diaconate and Priesthood.

25. Carlton Chase, present Bishop of New Hampshire, is a near relative of the late Philander Chase, Bishop of Ohio, (1819–1831,) and of Illinois, (1835–1852.)

26. William Heathcote De Lancey, present Bishop of Western New York, and Charles Pettit McIlvaine, present Bishop of Ohio, are both descended from Col. Caleb Heathcote, younger brother of the Baronet Heathcote, of the last century.

#### V.—OTHER INTERESTING FACTS CONCERNING THE EPISCOPATE.

1. Gregory Nazianzum, the elder of the two of that name and title, was a Bishop 45 years, and died above 100 years of age.

2. Alexander, Bishop of Flavias, and afterwards of Jerusa-



lem, was a Bishop 40 years, and in the Ministry 59 years. He died, A. D., 251, a martyr.

3. Narcissus, also Bishop of Jerusalem, was in the Episcopate 41 years, and died, A. D., 237, aged 116 years, a martyr.

4. Hosius, the illustrious Bishop of Corduba, who presided in the Council of Nice, lived over 100 years, and was a Bishop about 70 years.

5. Wilfrid, of York, (A. D., 609,) was a Bishop 45 years, and had a remarkably troubled life. He was consecrated at the age of 30,—at the earliest Canonical age.

6. Ealstan, Bishop of Sherborne, (A. D., 867,) had possession of his See 50 years as its Bishop.

7. St. Patrick died about A. D., 493, aged 116 years, by the best accounts, having been a Bishop 70 years. Less reliable accounts state, that he ordained 350 Bishops, and 3,000 Priests and Deacons; exceeded only by Jacob Baradaeus, Syrian Bishop of Edessa, (A. D., 560,) who, during a long Episcopate, is said to have ordained 100,000 Bishops, Priests and Deacons!

8. St. David, Bishop of Caerleon, (A. D., 640,) was a Bishop 65 years, and died at the age of 106, some say 146 years.

9. Remigius, of Rhemes, (A. D., 525,) "Apostle of France," was a Bishop 74 years, and died at the age of 96 years, having been consecrated at the age of 22—an earlier age than the Canons permitted.

10. Eleutherius, an Illyrican Bishop, was consecrated at the age of 20. The ancient Canons made 30 the Canonical age; though the Apostolical Canons prescribed 50, under conditions.

11. Gregory, (A. D., 1127,) Bishop of Dunkeld, who had been Abbot of its Monastery, then converted into a Cathedral, was a Bishop over 42 years.

12. Wymund, (A. D., 1113,) Bishop of the Isles, after 40 years' Episcopate, was deprived, and his eyes put out. "*Primus autem Episcopus ibi fuerat Wymundus monachus Saisiniensis, (Sagiensis,) sed propter ejus importunitatem privatus fuit oculis et expulsus.*" Sais is in Normandy.

13. Henri de Cheyne, 1281, of Aberdeen, was a Bishop 52 years, according to one writer, or 48 years according to another, who dates his death in the same year as that of Robert Bruce.

He certainly was living 4 years later ; either would be a long Episcopate.

14. Alexander, of Ross, (A. D., 1357,) is mentioned as 48 years afterwards in the same See ; Keith says "50 and odd" years.

15. John Leslie, 1628, successively Bishop of the Isles, Raphoe and Clogher, enjoyed the Episcopal dignity above 50 years, and died at the age of 100, probably "the ancientest Bishop in the world," at the period of his death. When only an M. A., he traveled through France, Spain and Italy, the languages of which countries he spoke equally with the natives. He had such command of Latin, that it was said in Spain, *Solus Leslicus Latine loquitur.*"

16. Robert Douglas, 1684, of Dunblane, died at the age of 92, in the year 1716, having been 70 years in the ministry.

17. Thomas Wilson, (A. D., 1697,) the saintly Bishop of Sodor and Man, held his Bishopric 58 years.

18. Bishop James Chisholm, 1486, of Dunblane, was in the Episcopate 48 years.

19. Samuel, Archbishop of the United Armenian Church at Lemberg, Galicia, was living in 1857, aged 105 years.

20. Edward Harcourt, 1808, late Archbishop of York, was a Bishop about 40 years, and died in 1847, aged 91.

21. William White, 1787-1836, of Pennsylvania, was a Bishop 49 years, and died at the age of 89.

22. John George Beresford, present Archbishop of Armagh, has been a Bishop 57 years. He was consecrated to Raphoe in 1803, translated to Clogher in 1819, and then to Armagh in 1822. He is now about 90 years of age.

23. Archbishop Synge, (1716-42,) before noticed, had the singular fortune of being a Bishop and Primate, son of a Bishop of the same name, nephew of a Bishop, and father of two Bishops.

24. Kings and Princes have also become Bishops, as, *e. g.*, Cormac MacCulman, King of Munster and of Cashel, (A. D., 900,) was also the Bishop of Cashel. Olcobar MacKined, (A. D., 850,) King of Cashel, was also Bishop of Emly. Cenfeolad, (A. D., 870,) King of Cashel, was also Bishop of Emly. Ethelred I., (A. D., 790,) King of Northumberland, was a Bishop. Sigebert II., (A. D., 640,) King of East Anglia was a

Bishop. Ethelwolf, (A. D., 838,) King of England, is also reported to have received Episcopal Orders. Edbert, or Eadbert, (A. D., 740,) King of Northumbria, after a happy reign of 20 years, laid aside his crown, and lived 10 years longer in orders, under the discipline of his brother Egbert, Archbishop of York. Apollonius Sidonius, (A. D., 472,) a Prætorian Prefect of Rome, son-in-law of the Emperor, Patrician and Senator of Rome, laid aside his dignities and became the Bishop of Clermont.

25. Evagrius, Bishop of Antioch, was consecrated by one Bishop alone.

26. Pelagius I., (A. D., 560,) Bishop of Rome, was consecrated by two Bishops, a Presbyter assisting in place of the absent third, required by the Canons.

27. Armentarius was deprived of his jurisdiction by the Council of Riez, because he had been consecrated by less than the Canonical number.

28. Dioscorus, of Alexandria, had two consecrators only; and Siderius, of Palæbisca, was consecrated by only one Bishop, and was afterwards promoted to the Metropolitan See of Ptolemais, as we are informed by Synesius.

29. It was not an uncommon thing for the Romish intruding 'Vicars' to be consecrated by only one Bishop. Such consecrations among the Romanists in England and Ireland are so common, that they have in those countries no probable Episcopacy, except upon the supposition that they are valid, though uncanonical. Archbishop Carroll, the first Metropolitan of Baltimore, through whom most of the Prelates in this country trace their Episcopate, was consecrated by a single Bishop, who had himself been consecrated by a single Bishop.

30. In the American Church, seven instances are given, viz: those of Bishops Meade, Kemper, Williams, Whitehouse, Atkinson, H. Potter, and Odenheimer, of the union of as many as 7 Bishops as Consecrators, in each instance.

31. Three instances are given of the union of as many as 8 Consecrators, as in the elevation of Bishops Kip, Gregg, and Bedell; and in the English Church, in the consecrations of Bishops Gunning, in 1669, Mewes, in 1672, and Trelawney, in 1685.

32. Lanfranc, Archbishop of Canterbury, (A. D., 1070,) was raised to the Episcopate by 9 Bishops uniting.

33. Wilfrid, Archbishop of York, (A. D., 604,) was made a Bishop by the imposition of the hands of 12 Consecrators ; and in the American Church, Drs. Wainwright and Whipple had 10 Consecrators.

34. St. Cyprian, (*Ep. 59 ad Antoniam*), speaks of a Bishop, Cornelius, of Rome, who had been consecrated by 16 Bishops uniting.

35. In Carthage was a Bishop, Fortunatus, who asserted himself to have been consecrated by 23 Numidian Bishops, (A. D., 250.)

36. Bishops were sometimes made, *per saltum*, "at a leap," as it were, without entering the lower ministries ; though forbidden by the Canons, it was often done in extraordinary cases, on the principle, that the Episcopate involved and supplied the other Orders, as St. Jerome says, "*In Episcopo et Presbyter continetur.*" The famous St. Ambrose, (A. D., 385,) of Milan, was thus consecrated, *per saltum*. Nectarius, of Constantinople, and Eucherius, of Lyons, were both consecrated without the intervention of the inferior Orders. So also, Pope Constantine, (A. D., 708,) being a Layman, received all Orders by the one ordination to the Pontificate.

37. Many others were taken from the Diaconate, and, without a formal Ordination to the Priesthood, received it in the Episcopate, as Popes Nicholas I., Valentine, Benedict V., Paul I., Adrian I., Cæcilian, of Carthage, and others. Bingham's *Antiquities* (Vol. I., Bk. II. ch. 10,) gives sundry instances of such Ordinations, *per saltum*. See also, "*Essays on Anglican Ordinations*," second series, Vol. II., p. 244-6, (by Hugh Davey Evans, Esq., LL. D.)

38. Bishops John Spottiswood, of Glasgow, Gavin Hamilton, of Galloway, and Andrew Lamb, of Brechen, were consecrated *per saltum*, in 1610, by the English Bishops, Abbot, Andrewes, Neyle, and Parry. This was on the first restoration of the Episcopacy to Scotland. And, in 1661, on the second restoration of the Episcopacy, when Leighton and Sharp were elevated to that Order, it was proposed to dispense with

the inferior Orders, both having been Scotch Presbyterians ; but it was overruled, and they were first ordained Deacon and Priest, lest the contrary course might imply the validity of the Presbyterian ministry.

39. The 10th Canon of the Council of Sardica forbids all such Ordinations, *per saltum*, originally allowed ; the custom soon was so abused by Rome and its imitators, that it became prudent to limit it.

Pagi says, "Gregory VII. is the first Roman Pontiff, taken from the Order of Deacons, whom we know to have been ordained Presbyter before he could be ordained Pontiff, *whilst many before him, the grade of Presbyter being omitted, were honored with the Pontifical consecration, per saltum.*"

40. Photius, (A. D., 858,) of Constantinople, to avoid the imputation of not coming to his Bishopric regularly, was, on the first day, made a Monk, on the second, a Reader, on the third, a Sub-Deacon, on the fourth, a Deacon, on the fifth, a Priest, and on the sixth, a Bishop.

41. Bishop Bull was made Deacon and Priest in one day, at the age of 21, by a Bishop Robert Skinner of Oxford, who was then deprived, and acting as Rector of a Parish,—the only Bishop who conferred Orders during the usurpation.

42. Bishop Jeremy Taylor and Archbishop Usher were both Ordered before the age of 21 ; and Archbishop Sharp was Ordered Priest under the canonical age.

43. As regards the titles and designations accorded to Bishops, it is curious and interesting to know, that nearest to the Apostles' day, no designation was more common to all the Bishops than "*Apostles.*" Afterwards, the Bishops themselves thought it honorable enough to be called "*Successors of the Apostles.*" Every See was called an "*Apostolic See,*" which in those days was not a peculiar title of the See of Rome. Bishops were also called "*Fathers,*" and "*Pontiffs,*" and "*Vicars of Christ,*" and the like ; titles of honor and reverence, in which all had as much interest as he who has since laid exclusive claim to such designations, and degrades his Bishops to the mere rank of "*Vicars of the Holy See,*" holding their mission at his will and pleasure.

44. Although Bishop Seabury was the first Canonical Bishop of the American Church, it is known that there were two Anglican Bishops in this country before his day, viz : Bishops Robert Welton, (consecrated 1723,) and John Talbot, (consecrated at the same time,) the former by one Bishop of the non-jurors, Ralph Taylor, and the latter by Bishops Taylor and Welton. Both these Bishops exercised Episcopal offices in America, though privately, for fear of the authorities ; Bishop Welton residing in Philadelphia, and Bishop Talbot, at Burlington, N. J. They are known to have worn the mitre and Episcopal robes, even in their private Offices. All was considered uncanonical, inasmuch as these Bishops acted, not as Suffragans, but in contravention of the authority of our then Diocesan, the Bishop of London. Talbot died in 1727, and was buried in the churchyard of St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J., of which he was Rector, and Welton retired to Portugal, where he died, in 1726, having previously been Rector of Christ Church, Philadelphia.

45. Bishops Seabury and Claggett also wore the mitre in their public Offices ; the mitre of Bishop Seabury is yet preserved in the Library of Trinity College, Conn.

46. The last of the non-juring Bishops was Charles Boothe, (1795-1805.) The crozier, which had been used by many of them in succession, is preserved in the family of Crossley, of Scaitcliffe, near Todmorden.

47. With regard to the "Nag's Head Consecration," from which, as some think, all our present Orders are, through Archbishop Parker, derived, it may be worth while to know another fact. *There is not a Bishop, Priest or Deacon, of the English, Scottish, or American Churches, who cannot trace his Orders back to the Apostles through other lines than that of Archbishop Parker.* This happens through the intervention of an Italian Archbishop, (De Dominis,) who in 1617 united with English Prelates in Consecrations ; and also of an Irish Archbishop, (Hampton,) in 1616, and again of an Irish Bishop, (Fuller,) who in 1667 united in consecrations of English Bishops. It thus happened that a century ago and more, every Bishop in England was enabled to trace his Episcopate independently of the Parker line.

## ART. III.—COOPER AND HIS NOVELS.

*Darley's Illustrated edition of COOPER'S Novels.* In thirty-two Volumes. New York: W. H. Townsend & Co.

THE new and beautiful edition of Cooper's Novels, now nearly completed, by Messrs. Townsend & Co., gives us an occasion, which we have long desired, to lay our hearty tribute upon the altar of his memory. He has done so much for his country's Literature, he saw so distinctly the narrow prejudices of the times in which he lived, he described so clearly and fearlessly the dangers to which, in the practical workings of our Government, our Institutions are exposed, and in which, alas, they are now threatened with remediless ruin; nay, more, as a Christian Moralist, he was so loyal to those great principles which the Church holds and teaches, that he richly deserves, on the pages of our Review, to be named with honor, and to be commended to the attention of the American people. It is not, however, as a Moralist that we are now to regard Mr. Cooper, though, we are glad to say, that in all his writings we have not found a line that would cause a blush upon the cheek of the most pure and refined. Neither, as Church Reviewers, shall we dwell upon the heroism with which he dared to plant himself upon the Christian Faith, as the only true fountain of Social Reform. We have here, undoubtedly, one secret of that bitter opposition, from a certain portion of the press, with which, in his later years, he was obliged to contend. There is another respect, also, in which Cooper's works merit the regard of Churchmen. Himself a Churchman by birth and education, he never hesitated, from a time-serving policy, to express the unscriptural authority and the true character of religious pretensions, which, in his day, were far more bold and intolerant than they are now. Thus in "The Sea Lions," he uses the lancet in the following style.

"There are two great species of deacons—one species belongs to the priesthood, and become priests and bishops; passing away, as priests and bishops are apt to



do, with more or less of the savor of godliness. The other species are purely laymen, and are *sui generis*. They are *ex officio*, the most pious men in a neighborhood, as they sometimes are, as it would seem to us, *ex officio*, also the most grasping and mercenary,"—p. 16. "Deacon Pratt had all the usual sectarian terms at the end of his tongue; never uttered a careless expression; was regular at meeting; apparently performed all the duties that his church required of its professors, in the way of mere religious observance; yet was he as far from being in that state which St. Paul has described succinctly as 'for me to live is Christ, and to die is gain,' as if he had been a Pagan.—p. 50."

Our present object, however, is to notice briefly some of his writings, to advert to some traits in his character, and to give a few of our own personal recollections of him.\*

Every reader of the "Pioneers" is familiar with Cooperstown and the rich forest scenery of Otsego Lake. One thing is wanting, however, to complete the picture of fifty years ago: a gray-eyed, dark-haired, ruddy boy, nimble as a deer and gay as a bird. Cooper was but an infant when he was first carried to Cooperstown. His birthplace was Burlington, New Jersey, where he first saw the light on the 15th of September, 1789, and the little village, which was to be the home of his boyhood and his final resting-place, had been built by his father only three years before. Judge Templeton has always been supposed to be an outline sketch of that gentleman, and the "Pioneers" tells us what kind of a life was led in this home which he had made for himself in the wilderness. Perhaps the love of the water which led Cooper to the Navy, was first imbibed on the Otsego, and the associations with which he has invested old ocean for so many minds, would thus be owing, in part, to a quiet little lake among the hills. Never was the "child" more truly "father of the man" than in Cooper.

At thirteen he entered Yale; too young, if that favorite institution had been what it is now, but yet old enough to prove himself an apt and ready scholar. The poet Hillhouse was in the same class, and younger than he. Dr. Dwight was then President, with a well-won reputation as a teacher, which has already outlived his claims as a poet. It would be interesting to know how the stripling, who was to become one of the real

---

\* "We refer the reader to a work which has already been reviewed in our pages; "Biographical Studies. By George Washington Greene. New York: G. P. Putnam. 1860."

founders of American literature, looked and felt in the presence of one of its earliest votaries. The young poet was something of a rogue, the old one not a little proud of his position ; and it is difficult to withstand the temptation of indulging the fancy in some amusing scenes between them ; the culprit looking straightforward with a funny mixture of drollery and indefinite dread of consequences in his clear, gray eye, and the old doctor bolt upright in his chair, with a thunder-cloud on his brow, and measuring out his oppressive sentences with Johnsonian dignity. The only recorded expression, as far as we know, of Cooper's opinion of the poetical merits of his old master, is his answer to Godwin's reference to the "Conquest of Canaan" and "Vision of Columbus" as the only American poems that he had ever heard of,—“Oh, we can do better than that now.”

College then as now, and perhaps even more than now, was the path to one of the learned professions ; and Cooper, whose tastes led him to seek for a more adventurous career, left it in his fourth year for the Navy. There were no schools in our Navy then, and it was common for the young candidate for nautical honors to make a voyage before the mast in a merchantman, by way of initiation ; a custom which Cooper, in looking back upon his own course from an interval of forty years, is far from approving. In his case, however, few will regret it. It was his first intercourse with sailors, his first initiation into the hardships and enjoyments, the pains and the pleasures of sea-life, which he surely could never have painted so truthfully but for that year and a half in the fore-castle.

It was in a round jacket and tarpaulin that the future guest of Rogers and Holland House first set his foot on English ground, his imagination glowing with the recollection of all that he had heard and read of her power and glory, and his heart thrilling with the thought that this was the land of his fathers. He was soon at home in London, ran through the usual round of sights, peered from under his tarpaulin at the wonders of the Tower and the beauties of the “West End,” and in the evening, amused the fore-castle with tales and descriptions from the scenes of his day's ramble.

There was another kind of experience, too, which Cooper added to his stock during this memorable voyage. The *Sterling* had hardly dropped her anchor in English waters before she was boarded by a man-of-war's boat, and one of her best men taken from her to be forced into the British Navy, another of them only escaping by having a certificate which the officer could not refuse to acknowledge, though he had refused to acknowledge his "protection." At London another was lost, and the Captain himself was seized by a press-gang. On their return passage, just as they were running out, they were boarded by a gun-boat officer, who attempted to press a Swede. Cooper could not stand this insult to his flag, and was in high words with the Englishman, when the Captain compelled him to restrain himself and be silent. Such were some of his first lessons in this rough but manly school. He now entered the Navy, and continued the study of his profession in its higher walks. How successful these studies were he has already proved by his writings; and years ago we heard him described by a brother officer, who knew him well, as active, prompt, and efficient, a pleasant shipmate, always ready to do his duty, and rigorous, too, in exacting it from others.

In 1811 he resigned his commission, and married Miss Delancey, whose gentle character and domestic tastes were admirably fitted to call out the deep affections of his own nature, and favor that grateful intermingling of action and repose which are so essential to vigor and freshness of mind. He had established himself in a quiet little house, which is still standing, at Mamaroneck, in Westchester county, not so near to the city as in these days of railroads and steamers, but near enough to make an excursion easy, and enable him to see his friends whenever he chose. He loved his books, he loved the quiet life of the country, he loved the calm sunshine of his home, and the days glided smoothly away, scarcely revealing to him or to those around him the powers which were rapidly maturing in this voluntary obscurity. It was this seeming monotony that furnished the occasion which first revealed his real calling. He was reading a new novel to his wife: "Pshaw," said he, "I can write a better one myself:" and to prove that he was

in earnest, he set himself directly to the task, and wrote the first chapter of "Precaution." "Go on," was Mrs. Cooper's advice, when she had listened to it as a young wife may be supposed to listen to the first pages from her husband's pen. The work was completed : a friend in whose literary judgment he placed great confidence, the late Charles Wilkes, gave a favorable opinion, and "Precaution" was printed. His vocation was now decided. His active mind had found its natural outlet, and yielding to the impulse of his genius, he took his station boldly on his native soil, amid the scenes of American history, and wrote the "Spy." The success of the "Spy" was complete, and almost immediate. It was not merely a triumph, but a revelation, for it showed that our own society and history, young as they were, could furnish characters and incidents for the most inviting form of romance. There was a truthfulness about it which everybody could feel, and which, in some countries where it has been translated, has given it the rank of a real history. And yet there was a skillful grouping of characters, a happy contrast of situations and interests, an intermingling of grave and gay, of individual eccentricities and natural feeling, a life in the narrative, and a graphic power in the descriptions, which, in spite of some common-place, and some defects in the artistic arrangement of the plot, raised it at once to the first class among the novels of the age. But its peculiar characteristic, and one to which it owed, above all others, its rank as a work of invention, was the character of 'Harvey Birch.'

The same originality of invention and admirable discrimination are found in his next great character, 'Leather Stocking.' In all that relates to his calling, Leather Stocking, like Harvey Birch, is a simple and natural character. They have the same judgment and common sense. But the shrewdness which was so well placed in the tradesman, would have shrunk into littleness and cunning in the man of the woods. Simple-heartedness, and clear, quick perception, would be his natural characteristics. Resolution would become fortitude and daring ; and his days and nights under the canopy of the woods, with the sunlight falling through the opening tree-tops as it falls on the

vaulted aisles of a cathedral, or the stars looking meekly out from their blue dwellings, still and silent, and yet with something in their silence which thrills the heart like choral symphonies, would awaken feelings that were unknown to those who sleep under close roofs, and tread the dusty thoroughfares of life; and 'Leather Stocking,' to be true to his nature, could not but be a poet. The same may be said, in a certain degree, of 'Long Tom,' who looked upon the ocean as 'Leather Stocking' looked upon the forest, never feeling his heart at ease until the waves were bounding under him.

We have, then, three characters from the common walks of life, each admirably fitted for his humble calling, and all equally raised above it by traits perfectly consistent with what it required or imposed. Love of country, pure and disinterested, makes the peddler a hero; the intrepid, loyal, upright, and devout character of the scout gives a charm and an authority to his words which mere rank and wealth can never command; and the simple-hearted coxswain, who draws you to him in life by his earnestness and purity, the defects as well as the beauties of his character, rises almost to the grandeur of martyrdom in his death. This power of elevating the lowly by the force of a high moral principle, was one of the most striking characteristics of Cooper's genius; and it is the more deserving of remark, inasmuch as it is a power which he drew from the peculiar elevation of his own moral nature. There has been but one man to whom it was given to look down upon human nature, as from some height that raised him far above its contaminations, and painting it in all its forms, its lights and its shades, its beauties and its deformities, leave you no other clue to his own character but the conviction that the mind which saw all things so truly, could not but love the good. In all writings but Shakspeare's, we judge the man by the book; and there are few who would come out from such a trial so honorably as Cooper.

The "Spy" was published in 1821; the "Pioneers" in 1823; then came the "Pilot," &c.; in 1826 he had covered the whole ground of his invention by the publication of the "Mohicans." It was not without some misgivings that he had ventured upon

the "Pilot," for he well knew that the effect of a description depends upon the skillful use of details, and here the details, if strictly professional, might be unintelligible. The friends to whom he spoke of his plan tried to dissuade him from it. They had been so accustomed to look upon the ocean as a monotonous waste, that they could not understand how it could be made interesting. More than once he was upon the point of throwing his manuscript into the fire. But the first thought of it had come to him by one of those sudden impulses to which we often cling more tenaciously than to designs that have been carefully matured. Scott had just published the "Pirate," which Cooper admired as a romance, but was unwilling to accept as an accurate picture of sea-life. The authorship of the "Waverly Novels" was still a secret, and one day, in discussing this point with a friend, it was argued that Scott could not have written them, because they displayed too minute and accurate an acquaintance with too wide a range of subjects. Where could he have made himself familiar enough with the sea, to write the "Pirate?" Cooper was by no means disposed to call the literary merits of the "Pirate" in question, but felt himself fully justified in disputing its seamanship. The only way of doing this was by writing a real tale of the sea, and the result was the "Pilot." The first favorable opinion that he received was from an Englishman a man of taste, and an intimate friend, but a sceptic in all that related to American genius. He read the sheets of the first volume, and to Cooper's great surprise pronounced it good.

As a still fuller test, he chose an old messmate for his critic, and read to him the greater part of the first volume, as Scott had read the hunting scene of the "Lady of the Lake" to an old sportsman. The first half hour was sufficient. As he came to the beating out of the "Devil's Grip," his auditor grew restless, rose from his seat, and paced the floor with feverish strides. There was no mistaking the impression, for not a detail escaped him. "It is all very well, my fine fellow, but you have let your jib stand too long." It was the counterpart of "He will spoil his dogs," of Scott's hunting critic. But Cooper, fully satisfied with the experiment, accepted the criticism, and "blew his jib out of the bolt-ropes."

He had already formed, as early as 1823, the design of illustrating American scenery by a series of tales, and spoke freely of it to his more intimate friends. Some of his excursions were studies of locality. For "Lionel Lincoln," he had visited Boston ; and it may not be uninteresting to Rhode Islanders to know that part of that work was written in Providence, in a house yet standing, just on the verge of the old elm trees of College street. It was then, too, probably, that he studied the scene of the opening chapters of the "Red Rover." Many a pleasant page might be filled with the records of these days : his studies of Shakspeare in the wonderful interpretations of Kean ; his conversations with Mathew ; his rambles with Dekay ; his daily chit-chats and discussions with old messmates at the City Hotel ; and a thousand other things, trifles often in themselves, but which, acting upon a mind by which so many other minds have been moved, would have a deep and permanent interest.

When he sailed for Europe, in 1826, his American reputation was at its height. His fame had preceded him. He was met with a kind welcome to the classic circle of Holland House ; was soon on intimate terms with Rogers ; Scott sought him out in Paris, and gladly renewed the acquaintance in London ; he lived in friendly intimacy with Lafayette ; and found, wherever he went, that kind of welcome which was most grateful to his independent spirit. He was fond of society. It was a pleasant study, and a kind of exercise that seemed essential to him. His conversational powers were of a high order, and he loved to bring them out. But he was a good listener, and, though tenacious of his opinions, a fair disputant. Meanwhile nothing was allowed to break in upon his literary duties. A portion of every day was set aside for composition ; and, by this systematic application, every twelve months told a tale of labor accomplished, which seemed a mystery to those who were ignorant of the secret of his industry. The "Prairie" and "Red Rover" appeared when he had been abroad but little over a year ; and five others were added to the list of his works before he returned in 1833, without counting the "Traveling Bachelor," the letters which formed the basis of his ten vol-



umes upon Europe, and his noble defense of the United States against the aspersions of the Royalists.

His time, after his return to the United States, was chiefly divided between New York, Philadelphia, and Cooperstown, in which last he had repaired the fine old mansion which his father had erected when the first hearthstone was laid on the shores of the Otsego. In this quiet retreat Cooper wrote seventeen new works of fiction, partly in completion of his original design, and some suggested by important questions of the day, in which he always took a lively interest, unbiased by local or party passions. Here, too, or rather while dividing his time between what he again called home and his two favorite cities, he wrote his "Naval History of the United States," the "Lives of Naval Commanders," two or three volumes upon government, and several pamphlets and reviews, upon subjects connected, for the most part, with Naval history. Several of these works excited a spirit of hostility, which gave itself vent in bitter criticisms upon the author as well as upon his writings. Regarding this as a wanton violation of private rights, he resolved to appeal to the law on every occasion, and carry the responsibility to the door of every calumniator. This necessarily involved him in a contest with the daily press, and subjected him to many petty annoyances, which would have worn sadly upon a mind less resolute or independent. But he came out of it triumphant, and with new claims to the respect of those whose good opinion he coveted. We need not here repeat the high tributes to Cooper's genius and worth which have been freely paid by our own greatest and best writers; but we will not withhold a brief extract from a leading English Review published soon after his decease.

"We accord to Cooper an equal degree of talent and power with that ascribed to Scott, and would place the originality of the American author at a higher point. There is certainly in Cooper more power of concentration, a more epigrammatic style, and greater terseness of expression.

No one can peruse the works of Cooper without being convinced of the innate beauty of his own mind. His ethical notions are of the highest order, his morality is as pure as that of the men whose unaffected religion he is so fond of portraying.

The philosophy of his mind is of a fine order, and few can be unsusceptible of this. The most ordinary reader must be conscious of a superiority and elevation of thought while he peruses the writings of Fenimore Cooper. The gentleness of

his own mind, its lofty appreciation of everything which was good, its innate poetry, breathed forth in his graphic descriptions of nature, in the love with which he regards the forests, the broad prairies, and the sunlighted valleys.

It is rarely so many qualities are combined in one writer. His name is endeared in his own country, and his productions will hand it down to posterity with undiminished lustre. *Cooper's Novels* will be standard works as long as fiction continues to excite an interest in the admirers of literature."

Soon after, he began to feel some indications of disease. His feet became tender, and he was unable to use them as freely as he had been accustomed to do. He apologized to us one morning at Putnam's for not rising to shake hands. "My feet are so tender," said he, "that I do not like to stand any longer than I can help." Yet when we walked out together into Broadway, we could not help turning every now and then to admire his commanding figure and firm bearing. Sixty years seemed to sit as lightly on him as fifty on the shoulders of most men; and when we remembered the astonishing proofs which he had given of vigor and fertility, we could not but believe that he had many a new creation in store for us yet. His last visit to New York was in April, 1851, and the change in his appearance was already such as to excite serious apprehensions among his friends. During the first few weeks after his return he seemed to be growing better, and wrote favorable accounts of himself to his friend and medical adviser, Dr. Francis. But soon the disease returned in full force, rapidly gaining upon the vital organs, and terminating, at last, in dropsy. His death is yet too recent to make his last hours a fit subject for description. Dr. Francis has told all that can be told without trespassing too far on the sanctity of private feelings, and has borne ample testimony to the beautiful example which he gave of resignation and faith. He died on the 14th of September, 1851, at half-past one in the afternoon. One day more, and he would have completed his sixty-second year.

In concluding this brief sketch, we shall be pardoned in giving a few personal recollections of the distinguished author, and in recalling some impressions then distinctly made upon our mind. We shall never forget the first day that we saw Cooper. It was at good old General Lafayette's, in that neat little apartment of rue d'Anjou, which has been the scene of

so many things that have hallowed it in so many memories. And the scene of that morning was a striking one, too, and not easy to be forgotten. Some of our readers may remember that, many years ago, the demon of speculation led one of those reckless white men, who have abandoned their own homes to live among the Indians, to parade some half dozen Osages through Europe, filling his purse at the expense of the poor natives, who believed all the while that they were enjoying the free hospitality of their fathers beyond the sea. Lafayette's kind heart was disgusted by this knavery, and he had granted them an audience at his own house, in the hope of persuading them to return home while it was yet in their power. We will not attempt to describe the scene: the groups that clustered in the hall, the crowd that thronged the street, the venerable form of that great and good man, who had done so much and suffered so much, and who stood there with that calm and noble bearing, that winning smile, and that air of serene self-possession which is said never to have abandoned him, either in triumph or in trial—the bright faces and bright eyes, the curiosity of some, the kindly sympathy of others, and the unconscious objects of all this gathering, seated, with all that they had left of their former life, their wild costume and habitual apathy, on the couches of a Parisian saloon. As we were gazing on this singular scene, with feelings more easily imagined than described, we saw a gentleman enter, whose appearance immediately called off the General's attention from the special guests of the hour. He was evidently in the prime of life, and of that vigor which air and manly exercise give, and with something in all his movements which awakened in you an instantaneous conviction, that the mind and will which governed them were of no ordinary energy and measure. We could not withdraw our eyes: we had seen heads of great men, and there were some great men close to us at that very moment—but there was none with such a full, expansive forehead, such strong, massive features, a mouth so firm without harshness, and an eye whose clear gray seemed to read you at a glance, while it met yours with the unflinching look of one that fears not to let you read him in turn. "Who is he?"

we whispered to a grand-daughter of the General's who stood near us. "Mr. Cooper: do you not know Mr. Cooper?—let me introduce you to him." "Cooper," said we to ourself, "can it be that we are within five paces of Cooper, and that there, too, are the feeble representatives of the race around which his genius has shed a halo like that of Homer's own heroes!" We were fresh from the "Mohicans," and our hand trembled as it met the cordial grasp of the man to whom we owed so many pleasing hours. We asked him about the Indians. "They are poor specimens," said he, "fourth-rate at the best in their own woods, and ten times the worse for the lives they have been leading here." We would gladly have prolonged the conversation, but the guests were beginning to move, and we were both borne onward by the throng.

A day or two afterwards we met him in the General's bedroom, and we mention it here, as it afforded us an opportunity of witnessing his first interview with Béranger, and seeing how warmly the great poet welcomed him. And next we met him at Florence, in his beautiful little villa, just a stone's throw from the walls. Two years had passed away, and he had been working all the while in the rich mine which his own hands had opened. His face showed it, and his manner showed it. They were the face and manner of a man whose mind is ever busy with something that he loves, who comes to his task cheerfully, and still feels bright and cheerful when he lays it aside, because he knows that there are new pleasures in store for him, when he returns to it again.

We have often heard Cooper speak of poetry, and hardly ever without bringing in something about Shakspeare. He was the most enthusiastic admirer of "Nature's darling" that we ever met. "Shakspeare," he said to us one day "is my traveling library. When I have got him with me, I never feel the want of any other book. Whatever humor I am in, he is sure to have something just suited to it. Grave or gay, practical or dreamy, lounging or wide awake, it is all one, for he has scenes and characters to fit them all. To a novel writer, above all, he is an invaluable friend. Publishers will have mottoes for every chapter; and how I should get along with-

out Shakspeare I cannot conceive. I like to take them from my cotemporaries whenever I can, and particularly from our own poets. It is a kind of compliment which they have a right to, and I am always glad when I can pay it. Sometimes, however, it is no easy thing. Many a page have I turned over and over without being able to find anything to my purpose ; but I never yet turned over three in Shakspeare without hitting upon just what I wanted."

We have always regretted that we did not make a memorandum of our last conversation with Cooper. It was at Putnam's that we met him—just after the appearance of the first volume of the new edition of his works ; an edition which, with that of Mr. Irving's, would, to all who know the history of them, have been sufficient to associate the publisher's name with the annals of American literature, even if he had given no other proofs of his right to a place there. Cooper was in excellent spirits, though the disease which not long afterwards assumed so fatal a form, was just beginning to make itself felt. We walked out together, and, after a short stroll, went to his rooms at the Globe, and sat down to talk. We had never found him so free before upon the subject that interested us most—his own works and his literary habits. He talked about "Leather Stocking"—confessed freely his partiality for that exquisite creation of his happiest moments, and told how glad he had been to revive him again. "I meant," said he, "when I brought him on the stage anew, to have added one more scene and introduced him in the Revolution ; but I thought that the public had had enough of him, and never ventured it." We tried to persuade him that the public interest had been excited, rather than satiated, by this resuscitation of their old favorite. "I have thought a good deal about it," said he, "and perhaps I may do it yet." But the works he had already in hand claimed his immediate attention, and before he found himself free for new labors, the progress of his disease had become too rapid to leave much room for other thoughts than those with which his mind, naturally inclined to devotion, had long been familiar.

Those who have read Cooper carefully will find, that in his

mind the religious sentiment, though never dormant, became stronger and more definite as he drew nearer to the grave. It has been truly said, that there is nothing in his works which could embitter his death-bed. From the first, they breathe a pure and healthy morality, and an earnest sense of higher duties and obligations. Nothing can be more beautiful than the religion of "Long Tom" and "Leather Stocking. There is a beautiful mixture of simplicity and grandeur in their conceptions of the Creator. They have studied Him in His own works; they recognize His power, for they have seen it manifested in its sublimest forms; they seem almost to grasp that sublimity itself in their strong conceptions, and read its awful lessons with a throbbing heart, but unaverted eye. They love Him, too—for they love the glorious works that He has made; and that love, pervading their whole nature, gives worth and estimation to the meanest production of His will. And from this arises a sense of duty so deep and so firm—a perception of right so instinctive and so true—such love of justice, and such fearlessness of purpose—that, without ceasing for a moment to be the humble coxswain or unlettered scout, they are men at whose feet the best and wisest may sit meekly and learn.

But these sentiments, which are merely scattered at intervals through his earlier works, are more clearly interwoven with the web and texture of the latter. The "Pathfinder" is everywhere devout; but "Hetty," in the "Deer Slayer," is formed of materials which required a strong religious conviction to handle aright. Genius might have formed some beautiful conception, but would never have given to it that truthfulness and nature, which almost make us forget the intellectual deficiencies of the poor maiden in the pure-hearted and earnest simplicity of the believer.

But it was not to attempt an analysis of Cooper, either as an author or as a man, that we took up our pen. What Bryant has done so happily in his address, as remarkable for the just conception which he had formed of his office, as for chastened beauty of execution, it would be presumption in us to

repeat. We trust that some other friend of Cooper will follow the example of Dr. Francis, and give the world his recollections. The Doctor himself, while he lived, could he have found time, in the midst of his professional labors, to fill up the sketch which he began with so much good taste and such admirable judgment, would have added greatly to the important services which he has rendered to the cause of letters. Meanwhile we commend to the attention of our readers this beautiful edition of Cooper's Novels. They will, we are sure, find a place even in the most select libraries of American Literature.



## ART. IV.—MOTLEY'S HISTORY OF THE DUTCH REPUBLIC.

*The Rise of the Dutch Republic.* A History. BY JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY, D. C. L. 3 Vols., 8vo. New York: 1859.

THE work of Mr. Motley supplies a want which the student of history has long lamented. It is surprising that the Rise of the Dutch Republic should have hitherto claimed no larger space in the literature of England and America; for no subject could be more interesting to a free people than the war which wrested the Netherlands from the grasp of Spain;—a war begun, not for political or commercial, but for religious interests; a war which eventuated in the rise of the Dutch to a splendid career of wealth and greatness, while it was to Spain the beginning of that series of disasters which led to her ultimate decline; a war, of which the obstinacy has been seldom equaled, and the ferocity of which had not been witnessed on the earth since Jerusalem fell before the arms of Vespasian. It is the design of the present paper to take a rapid review of the most prominent events in this great contest, from the Insurrection of Ghent, to the death of William, Prince of Orange.

Nor can we forbear all allusion to the country in which this war was waged, and to the origin of its inhabitants. For the country, our only surprise may be, that it should ever have been thought worth defending. No beauty of landscape, such as entrances the traveler in England, or Germany, or France; no towering mountains or vine-clad hills; no cloudless skies and balmy atmosphere, invite him to linger here. A land formed by the slime of rivers, low, wet, spongy, and often overwhelmed by the sea; vast plains, whose monotony is broken only by sluggish rivers; a leaden sky, and a climate always exhaling dampness,—such is no unfair picture of the land which has been aptly called *Holland*—"Hollow-land" or "marshy land." The people of this region are partly of German, partly of Celtic origin. The Belgæ of Cæsar's time

were reckoned the bravest of all the Gauls,—a reputation which, Mr. Motley thinks, “may be attributed to the presence of several German tribes,” who “lent an additional mettle to the Celtic blood.” The Island of Bet-auw, having been forsaken by its inhabitants, was seized by the Cattians,\* a fierce German—*Gehr-man*—“War-man”—tribe, who, on settling in Bet-auw, assumed the name of Batavians. “Of all these nations,” says Tacitus,† “the Batavians are the bravest. You may see other armies rushing to a battle; the Cattians march to a war. From the age of manhood they encourage the growth of their hair and beard; nor will any one, until he has slain an enemy, divest himself of that excrescence, which, by a solemn vow, he has dedicated to heroic virtue. Over the blood and spoils of the vanquished the face of the warrior is, for the first time, displayed.” To the North-East of the Batavians, in the territory lying between the Rhine and the Ems, we see another element of this race in the Frisians,—“a name,” says Tacitus,‡ “celebrated throughout Germany.” Between these German and Celtic races was a strong physical resemblance: both were of fair complexion and gigantic stature; but the resemblance was only a physical one;—in all other respects the two races were very dissimilar. A love of ostentation has always characterized the Gaul, as a contempt of it has always characterized the German. In the time of Cæsar, the nobility and priesthood formed the only orders in Gaul; the people were slaves. The German of the same era lived under a governmental system, in which the regal power was modified by a democratic element. The Gaul was fond of pastoral and agricultural occupations; the German scorned the slavery of labor, and regarded war as the only occupation worthy of a man. The Gaul built villages, but the home of the German was the pathless forest. The great difference, however, in the habits of these two races, may be traced to their religious and social systems, which are thus finely contrasted by Mr. Motley.

---

\* *Nomen habitatoribus, et origo a Cattis — Grot.*

† *De mor. Ger. c. 31.*

‡ *Ann. c. 74.*

"The Gauls were a priest-ridden race. Their Druids were a dominant caste, presiding even over civil affairs, while in religious matters their authority was despotic. What were the principles of their wild theology, will never be thoroughly ascertained, but we know too much of its sanguinary rites. The imagination shudders to penetrate those shaggy forests, ringing with the death-shrieks of ten thousand human victims, and with the hideous hymns, chanted by smoke-and-blood-stained priests, to the savage gods whom they served.

"The German in his simplicity had raised himself to a purer belief than that of the sensuous Roman or the superstitious Gaul. He believed in a single, supreme, Almighty God, *All Vater*, or All Father. This Divinity was too sublime to be incarnated or imaged, too infinite to be inclosed in temples made with hands. Such is the Roman's testimony to the lofty conceptions of the German. Certain forests were consecrated to the unseen God, whom the eye of reverent Faith could alone behold. Thither, at stated times, the people repaired to worship. They entered the sacred grove with feet bound together, in token of submission. Those who fell were forbidden to rise, but dragged themselves backward on the ground. Their rites were few and simple. They had no caste of priests, nor were they, when first known to the Romans, accustomed to offer sacrifice. It must be confessed that, in a later age, a single victim, a criminal or a prisoner, was occasionally immolated. The purity of their religion was soon stained by their Celtic neighborhood. In the course of the Roman dominion it became contaminated, and, at last, profoundly depraved. The fantastic intermixture of Roman Mythology with the gloomy but modified superstition of Romanized Celts, was not favorable to the simple elements of German theology. The entire extirpation, thus brought about, of any conceivable system of religion, prepared the way for a true revelation. Within that little river territory, amid those obscure morasses of the Rhine and Scheld, three great forms of religion,—the sanguinary superstition of the Druid, the sensuous polytheism of the Roman, the elevated, but dimly-groping creed of the German, stood for centuries face-to-face, until, having mutually debased and destroyed each other, they all faded away in the pure light of Christianity.

"Thus contrasted were Gaul and German in religious and political systems. The difference was no less remarkable in their social characteristics. The Gaul was singularly unchaste. The marriage state was almost unknown. Many tribes lived in most revolting and incestuous concubinage, brethren, parents, and children having wives in common. The German was loyal as the Celt was dissolute. Alone among barbarians, he contented himself with a single wife, save that a few dignitaries, from motives of policy, were permitted a larger number. On the marriage-day, the German offered presents to his bride,—not the bracelets and golden necklaces with which the Gaul adorned his fair-haired concubine,—but oxen and a bridled horse, a sword, a shield, and a spear, symbols that thenceforward she was to share his labors, and to become a portion of himself. They differed, too, in the honors paid to the dead. Both burned the corpse, but the Celt cast into the flames the favorite animals and even the most cherished slaves and dependents of the master. Vast monuments of stone or piles of earth were raised above the ashes of the dead. Scattered relics of the Celtic age are yet visible throughout Europe, in these huge but unsightly memorials.

"The German was not ambitious at the grave. He threw neither garments nor odors upon the funeral pyre, but the arms and war-horse of the departed were

burned and buried with him. The turf was his only sepulchre; the memory of his valor his only monument. Even tears were forbidden to the men. 'It was esteemed honorable,' says the historian, 'for women to weep, for men to remember.'

Such were the characteristics of the races by which the Netherlands were peopled. Our limits will not allow us to follow this most accomplished historian in his narrative of the convulsions that agitated the country previous to the Great Revolt. The insurrection of Civilis against the Roman power, the thundering march of the barbarian tribes, the dominion of Charlemagne, the five succeeding feudal centuries—the reign of Philip the Good, of Charles the Bold, of the Lady Mary, and the Austrian Succession, with Philip the Fair,—these we can only mention, as our purpose is with the events of a succeeding age. Of the marriage of Philip the Fair, Archduke of Austria, with Joanna, Queen of Spain, was born Count Charles the Second, of Holland, "better known as Charles the Fifth, King of Spain, Sicily, and Jerusalem, Duke of Milan, Emperor of Germany, Dominator in Asia and Africa, Autocrat of half the world."

Three centuries have passed away since Charles V. swayed the sceptre of this wide dominion, yet his character looms up above those of his royal cotemporaries, and stands out, in colossal proportions, amid the men of ten generations. It was his destiny to be ushered into life at a time when the advancing and the receding ages were separated by a great gulf which no human art could span. It was his destiny, too, to see the first onset of that moral Revolution which has changed the face of the globe; which has struck down the once puissant German Empire from the position of the first power in Europe; and, while raising fourth and fifth-rate kingdoms to an unprecedented height of power and splendor, plunged old and powerful nations into exhaustion and decay. In contemplating the character of Charles V., we are at a loss whether to wonder more at the fortunate circumstances in which his early life was cast, or at the extent of his sagacity and the greatness of his ambition. Born with the memorable sixteenth century, we find him, at the age of sixteen, a youth of graceful figure and fine address, writing Commentaries on the "Book of Sen-

tences," and devoted to every species of manly and athletic exercise. At this early age, the last will of Ferdinand leaves to Charles the kingdom of Spain; but the kingdom is in a turbulent condition, and nothing but the masterly address of Cardinal Ximenes can induce the Castilian nobility to acknowledge Charles as king. But Charles having, by the peace of Noyon, secured a passage to Spain, by his presence reconciles the antagonistic elements, and lays the basis of a permanent tranquility in that kingdom. Scarcely, however, has the young king seated himself on the throne of Castile, when the death of Maximilian, Emperor of Germany, opens for him the way to a still more splendid career. The throne of Germany was, in that age, the dearest object of royal ambition, as the German empire ranked first among the powers of Europe. For such a prize it was to be expected that there would be many competitors; but the eyes of the world were fixed on two kings, both of whom desired it with equal ardor, and each of whom was already too powerful. These two were Charles and his great rival, Francis of France. Between the claims of these two kings, the electors of the empire were divided. But, Frederick, Duke of Saxony, whom they ultimately selected, to the exclusion of both Charles and Francis, having declined the honor in favor of the abler Charles, the latter ascended the throne of Germany in spite of the exertions of Francis and the intrigues of Leo X. The great prize was now attained: it brought with it an immense influence and glory; it made Charles the foremost man of the world, but it gave him no increase of absolute power. For the liberties of Germany were fenced in by the most careful guards; nor are statesmen yet agreed whether the genius of the old German empire was monarchical or republican,—so carefully were the two elements combined.\* Yet, the fruits of his elevation were enough to

---

\* Among the members of the Germanic body, which is a great republic composed of states almost independent, the first principle of patriotism is, to depress and limit the power of the Emperor, and of this idea, so natural under such a form of government, a German politician seldom loses sight. To this prudent precaution many of the great families in Germany owed the splendor and independence which they had acquired during that period.—*Robertson's Charles V., lib. I., p. 86.*

render Charles the cynosure of the age and the envy of his brother monarchs. Francis was unable to conceal his chagrin at the result of the electoral vote. The remainder of his life was spent in an almost unceasing warfare with his more fortunate rival. The account of the wars between these two monarchs comprises the history of Europe for nearly thirty years. Germany, England, France, Spain, the various States of Italy, the Netherlands, the Turks, were all involved in a series of contests originating in the wounded self-love of the French King and the ambition of the German Emperor, and scarce terminating with the death of the one, and the retirement of the other within the monastery of St. Yuste. The life of Charles V. was a scene of uninterrupted labor in the cabinet and the field, at home and abroad. The ruler of so many kingdoms was compelled to be constantly in motion. Nine times he visited Germany, six times he visited Spain; Italy, seven times; France, four times; the Netherlands, ten times; England, twice; and Africa, as often. His military enterprises were nearly always crowned with a splendid success. The battle of Pavia resulted in the utter defeat of the French and the surrender of their King a prisoner of war; nor, if we except Maurice, of Saxony, were his efforts less successful against the German princes who revolted against his sway. The genius of this great man is most clearly seen in the minute attention which he gave to each portion of his dominions, and the masterly manner in which, holding the reins of power with a grasp of iron, he could anticipate and thwart the plans of his enemies, break up the most formidable coalitions formed against him, humble France, subdue Italy, storm and sack Rome, oppose and defeat the efforts of Papal power, and, after all, retire from the theatre of European politics, broken, indeed, in health by his herculean exertions, yet victorious over foreign and domestic foes.

Amid such a number of sovereignties, grouped together under the sway of one master mind, the Low Countries could present but an insignificant spectacle. Charles, indeed, was always partial to the Netherlands; for there he was born: nor was he ever better pleased than when, called from the arduous



duties which engaged him in his other dominions, he found himself among a people whose language was his mother tongue, and among whom he moved, not as a despotic sovereign, but as the first citizen of a free commonwealth. Nor were the provinces insensible to this partiality. But, if there was any peculiarity that marked the Dutch, it was the love of money. The immense military enterprises of Charles could not be prosecuted without money, of which, indeed, he was always in want. At the time of his projected invasion of France, his coffers were empty; and the Governess of the Netherlands, being ordered by Charles to invade France with all her disposable forces, was compelled to ask from the Provinces a sum sufficient to justify the undertaking. The representatives of the States,—those of Flanders among them,—voted a subsidy of twelve hundred thousand florins, of which Flanders was to pay one-third, as its quota. The burden of the share of Flanders naturally fell on Ghent, its chief city, and the money-loving burghers insisted that no tax could be laid *on them* without their express consent. There was nothing whatever to justify such an assumption. But the citizens of Ghent, having made up their minds to pay nothing, defied the Regent, and sent Commissioners to lay their claims to exemption before Charles himself. But the Emperor received them with that haughtiness which, on occasion, he could so well assume, and, the Council of Malines having decided against them, the citizens of Ghent rushed headlong into rebellion against the mightiest potentate of Europe. The contest was short. Charles, with a formidable body of troops, repaired to Ghent, at whose gates he was met by an embassy from the citizens imploring mercy. His words were few; his acts were summary. Twenty-six of the rebels were executed; the liberties and privileges of Ghent were utterly withdrawn; its form of government was changed, and orders given to erect a strong citadel which should command the town, the expenses to be paid by the rebellious city.

But, the time approached when the mind of the great Emperor grew weary of the cares of State, and, to the astonishment of all Europe, he announced his speedy abdication. This, indeed, had only been delayed for some time for political considera-



tions ; for Charles was desirous of seeing his realms in a peaceful condition, before transmitting them to his son, and, still further, of inducing Ferdinand to waive his claims to the throne of Germany in favor of Philip. But, having failed in accomplishing these results, he decided to postpone no longer an event which the increasing infirmities of his system rendered imperative. In the palace of the Dukes of Brabant, at Brussels, surrounded by the great nobles of the State and the Knights of the Golden Fleece, at the age of fifty-five, the Emperor, leaning on the shoulder of the Prince of Orange, read the articles of his abdication. In a comprehensive address he stated the most prominent events of his government, and, turning to Philip, exhorted him to use his power for the interests and the happiness of the people.

We must here leave Charles, and turn to Philip, whose policy proved so fatal to the Spanish interests in the Netherlands. The father and the son bore no resemblance to each other, either in cast of person or of mind. Charles was politic, and well understood the art of accommodating himself to the tempers, the manners, and the prejudices of the various peoples over whom he ruled. Philip, on the contrary, made no effort to render his presence agreeable to any but the Spaniards, to whom he was attached, and whose sombre feelings harmonized with his gloomy mind. Charles was a great warrior, a profound statesman, a man of iron will, and of gigantic views ; Philip was astute, crafty, narrow-minded, imbued with no correct knowledge of the wants of his subjects or of the art of governing them,—no soldier, no statesman,—better fitted for the cloister than the throne. The splendor of Charles's achievements made him popular, because it dazzled the minds of his subjects ; but they were disgusted with the haughtiness, the weakness, the bigotry, of Philip. But, whatever the personal character of Philip, they could not be blind to his power, which, although greatly inferior to that of his father, was yet sufficient to render him the most formidable king in Europe. His sway extended not only over Spain, but the Sicilies, the Netherlands, the Burgundies, and Milan. He was also titular King of England, France, and Jerusalem, and Dominator

in Asia, Africa, and America. Such was the power possessed by the man who, in his very first journey out of Spain, made himself "disagreeable to the Italians, detestable to the Flemings, odious to the Germans!" Let it not be supposed, however, that he was a negative, or an insipid character. From his father he derived that unconquerable obstinacy and perseverance which characterize the German races; but, unfortunately, they were ill-directed. His distinguishing trait was superstition. His devotion to the Church of Rome was excessive. By his persevering exertions to extirpate Protestantism, he sacrificed the best interests of his crown. His attachment to the Romish religion was a consequence, not only of the education which he had received, but of the original constitution of his mind. To the support of the Roman Church against the Protestants of Europe, he lent the entire weight of his influence and power. The religious dissensions which had agitated Europe, and particularly Germany, during his father's reign, at length reached the Netherlands, which had never been distinguished for a blind adherence to the Roman See, and the people of which, attracted by commercial interests from every quarter of the Globe, possessed no real homogeneity of religious faith. Waldo, Huss, Luther, and Calvin, had all found disciples in the Netherlands. These sects, however, had but little influence; it remained for Philip and the Inquisition to organize them in a formidable array.

Scarcely had Philip concluded that treaty of peace with France which his father had failed to secure, than he resolved to return to Spain. Margaret of Parma, his sister, he appointed Regent of the Netherlands. The Bishop of Arras, better known as Cardinal Granvella, addressed the estates in the name of the king, and, after adverting to the triumphant close which had marked the career of Philip's arms, he called their attention to the "new, reprobate, and damnable sects," which existed among them. He informed them that the 'Regent' had been ordered rigidly to enforce the decrees of Charles and Philip against the heretics. The reply of the deputies of the estates was loyal: that of Artois, however, begged his majesty to order the Spanish troops from the country; nor were the deputies from the other States undecided in this re-

spect: none would pay their share of the contingents which Philip had asked, on any other condition. In addition to this, a remonstrance was presented to the king, in which the disorders of the troops and the sufferings which they occasioned the inhabitants were portrayed. Philip, although enraged at this boldness, did not return a positive refusal. He represented that the troops, whose numbers were inconsiderable, were needed for the protection of the country, and that they could not be dismissed until their arrears of pay were sent from Spain. By appointing the Prince of Orange and Count Egmont to command the troops, he reconciled the people, in a measure, to their temporary stay. At the same time, by letters to the authorities, he gave orders that all heretics should be executed in the promptest manner, carefully explaining, that he did not allude to the Anabaptists alone, but to the Lutherans also. Having thus completed his arrangements, Philip prepared to leave the provinces; but his suspicious mind would not allow him to embark without a threatening insult to the Prince of Orange, who treasured up the wrong to a later day. It is not improbable that Philip had some cause to suspect the fidelity of Orange. He seems to have regarded Orange as a dangerous demagogue, whose subtle arts had already interfered with his plans, and who was capable and disposed to work him further trouble. His object seems to have been to terrify Orange, by hinting that his sly practices were known. But the menace produced an effect very different from the intention of the king. It made the Prince his enemy, and Orange was a dangerous foe.

William, Prince of Orange, surnamed the Silent, was born of an ancient and noble German family. He had been educated at the Court of Charles V., who, discerning in the youth the future greatness of the man, had honored him with repeated proofs of his affection and esteem. Orange has been well described as "one of those lean and pale-faced men who, according to Cæsar's words, 'sleep not at night and think too much,' and before whom the most fearless spirits quail. The calm tranquility of a never varying countenance concealed a busy, ardent soul, which never ruffled even the veil behind

which it worked, and was alike inaccessible to artifice and to love ; a versatile, formidable, indefatigable mind, soft and ductile enough to be instantaneously moulded into all forms ; guarded enough to lose itself in none ; and strong enough to endure every vicissitude of fortune." At the time of the signing of the treaty of peace between France and Spain, Orange was Philip's hostage in France. His fellow-hostage was the Duke of Alva. The French King, being alone with Orange on one occasion, indiscreetly confided to him a project which the two kings had formed, of exterminating the Protestants. Orange was struck with horror and amazement, but no change of countenance or of voice betrayed his feelings. To this presence of mind he owed the epithet of "the Silent," which is immortally attached to his name. Possessed of this information, he began, as soon as he returned to the Netherlands, to urge the departure of the Spanish troops, which Philip had designed as an instrument for the work of extermination.

Philip having left the Netherlands, Margaret of Parma assumed the government, assisted by a Council of five persons. But the Council was chiefly ruled by Cardinal Granvella, a man devoted to the king, and a foe to the national liberties. He looked with contempt on the people, whom he termed "a vile and mischievous animal." Possessed of high station, of vast wealth, and of splendid talents, he exercised an immense influence over the mind of the king. We can account for the dilatory character of all Philip's acts relative to the Netherlands, if we remember that Granvella was at Brussels, and Philip at Madrid ; and that, whenever application was made to Philip, the matter was referred to Granvella, who dictated the answer to Philip, who, in turn, sent it back to Brussels ! The Cardinal's known talents for intrigue made him an object of suspicion and of terror, while his unbounded ascendancy over Philip, rendered him equally an object of hatred. His unpopularity was also much increased by the Ecclesiastical Reform, which we must now consider.

In all the Netherlands there were but four Episcopal Sees,—a number ridiculously disproportioned to the population. These were the Sees of Utrecht, Cambray, Arras, and Tournay.

Philip had entreated Paul IV. to increase the number of Sees. In compliance with this request, his successor, Pius IV., instituted three Archbishoprics ; that of Malines, with six Bishoprics ; that of Cambray, with four ; and that of Utrecht, with five. The news of this innovation was received with ominous murmurs. The increase of the Ecclesiastical power, as well as the edicts which Philip had issued against the Protestants, were alleged to be in opposition to the ancient charters of the provinces, which Philip had subscribed : nor was the retention of the Spanish troops more conformable to those charters. The "Joyous Entry," as the Constitution of Brabant was called, explicitly provided, "that the Prince of the land should not elevate the clerical state higher than of old hath been customary, and by former princes settled." Furthermore, the prince had no power to prosecute either a native subject or a foreign resident, except in the regular courts of law. The prince was also forbidden to appoint any foreigner to office. This charter declared that if the prince violated any of these articles, the people, having entered regular protest against such violation, should be released from their vows of allegiance to the prince. Thus, the Brabant Charter was a regular compact between the people and the prince, by the terms of which the people, for the consideration specified, agreed to serve the prince with fidelity. That this was a liberal charter, at least for that age, will not be questioned. It was more liberal than the Constitutions of several of the first States of Europe at the present day. And, if it be true, as Mr. Motley asserts, that "nearly all the provinces possessed privileges, equally ample, duly signed and sealed," we can understand the political condition of the Netherlands at the time when they entered on their deadly contest with Spain.

The increase of the Ecclesiastical establishment, however desirable it might be when the religious interests of the provinces were considered, gave great offence, because it was clearly opposed to the existing compacts between the sovereign and the people. Nor would this dissatisfaction have been so great, had the Ecclesiastics been invested with a reasonable degree of power. All classes were equally offended and alarmed. To

Cardinal Granvella attached all the odium of this measure, both because he was personally interested in its execution, and because he was known to possess an unbounded influence over the king. The Prince of Orange, together with Berghen and Egmont, warmly opposed the Ecclesiastical change, and Orange declared that it was designed to introduce the Spanish Inquisition in the provinces. This seemed the more probable, as the Spanish troops had not yet been withdrawn. The popular feeling against them had now become so intense, that even Granvella urged their withdrawal. But, although they finally left, the general hatred of Granvella kept alive the exasperation against the government. The provinces were alarmed by sinister rumors ; there was a widely diffused dread of coming calamity, of which the Cardinal was regarded as the agent. In truth, Granvella was, at this time, maturing his plans for a general persecution of suspected persons. His arrogance had, by this time, inflamed the rage of the Netherlandish nobles ; but it was a pointless rage, for Granvella was beyond their power. Egmont, indeed, on one occasion, drew his dagger on the Cardinal, in the very presence of the Regent. But Orange was too shrewd to commit himself by such an act of folly. The Cardinal and he,—two masters in the art of dissimulation,—assumed the appearance of fraternal regard for each other. Even the most disciplined minds, however, cannot always conceal their emotions. The Cardinal and the Prince soon came to an open rupture in the Council ; and Granvella, in his letters to the king, inveighed against the dangerous ambition of Orange, Egmont, and Horn.

The declaration of Orange, that the kingdom designed to introduce the Spanish Inquisition, roused the nation like a call to arms. An Inquisition had been organized in the Netherlands by Charles V., who, in the year 1521, appointed an Inquisitor-General in the provinces. Why, then, did they not rebel against Charles, instead of Philip ? The answer is, that Philip was not Charles. Charles was supreme in Europe, and his supremacy was the basis of the commercial greatness of the Netherlands. Thus, the Netherlanders, with an eye to business, tolerated the Inquisition which Charles had established.

Perhaps they were too sagacious to resist him : Ghent tried it once—we have seen with what success. But from whatever reason, no violent opposition to the Inquisitorial power occurred during his reign. But, the very name of the *Spanish* Inquisition, which it was Philip's darling aim to introduce among them, filled the people with rage and terror. A wiser prince than Philip would have seen the coming storm, and averted it by a timely concession. Even Charles had abandoned the effort to introduce the Spanish Inquisition, when he found that the dread of its introduction into Antwerp bade fair to ruin that flourishing city. But Philip's zeal for the Romish religion was too fervid to be restrained by any considerations for the temporal welfare of his people. He would rather have seen the country a desert, than polluted by Protestantism. To one, whose mind had been so warped by superstition as his had been, the Spanish Inquisition seemed a holy Institution for saving men's souls. In reality it was a disgrace to the Christian religion and to humanity. It had been originally instituted to convert the Moors. The rise of so many Protestant sects, and the hideous disorders which stained the early career of some of them, furnished it with an apology for its existence and a wide field for its exertions. It is no exaggeration to term it the most dreadful engine of Superstition that has ever afflicted the world.

Is it surprising, that the Netherlands were unwilling to see this Institution forced upon them ? They had already an Inquisitorial police, but it was very different from the Spanish Inquisition. Yet it must be admitted, that the one which they had was not too lenient. The instructions which the Inquisitors had received from the Emperor were ample enough.

"They were empowered," Mr. Motley says, "to inquire, proceed against and chastise all heretics, all persons suspected of heresy, and their protectors. Accompanied by a notary, they were to collect written information concerning every person in the provinces, 'infected or vehemently suspected.' They were authorized to summon all subjects of his majesty, whatever their rank, quality, or station, and to compel them to give evidence, or to communicate suspicions. They were to punish all, who pertinaciously refused such depositions, with death. The Emperor commanded his Presidents, Judges, Sheriffs, and all other Judicial and Executive officers, to render 'all assistance to the Inquisitors and their familiars in their holy



and pious inquisition, whenever required so to do; on pain of being punished as encouragers of heresy, that is to say, with death. Whenever the inquisitors should be satisfied as to the heresy of any individual, they were to order his arrest and detention by the Judge of the place, or by others arbitrarily to be selected by them. The Judges, or persons thus chosen, were enjoined to fulfill the order, on pain of being punished as protectors of heresy; that is to say, with death, by sword or fire. If the prisoner were an Ecclesiastic, the inquisitors were to deal summarily with the case, 'without noise or form in the process, selecting an imperial counsellor to render the sentence of absolution or condemnation.' If the prisoner were a lay person, the inquisitor was to order his punishment, according to the edicts, by the Council of the province. In case of lay persons suspected but not convicted of heresy, the inquisitor was to proceed to their chastisement, 'with the advice of a counsellor or some other expert.'"

Such was the power of the Netherlandish Inquisition. But, terrible as it was, that of Spain was more terrible still. It must be remarked, however, that the former had not been universally established throughout the provinces. "It had never been introduced into Luxemburg or Gröningen. In Gelderland, it had been prohibited by the treaty through which that province had been annexed to the Emperor's dominions, and it had been uniformly and successfully resisted in Brabant." But Philip, not satisfied with this Inquisition, was determined to establish that of Spain in all the provinces. The agitation of the people became threatening. A riot, which occurred at the attempted execution of two Protestant ministers of Valenciennes, shewed the coming storm. The people assaulted the executioners at the stake; the guards with difficulty conveyed the two prisoners back to prison; the people, following up their success, stormed the prison and rescued the ministers. The government took a bloody revenge: troops were ordered to Valenciennes, and vast numbers of the inhabitants executed by fire and sword.

These barbarities, which were attributed to the evil counsels of Granvella, excited the popular fury against him to the highest pitch. His insolence had also inspired the nobles with the deadliest hatred towards him. Orange artfully availed himself of circumstances to exhibit to the nation the hatred with which the nobles regarded the Cardinal. Philip had demanded of the provinces a force of cavalry to assist in exterminating the Huguenots of France,—a demand, which increas-

ed the general ferment. Orange invited the Knights of the Golden Fleece to meet at his house, where, in addition to the general subject of the popular discontent, it was gravely inquired, "how it could be rendered practicable to discuss political matters, in future;"—a question which pointed directly at the arbitrary conduct of Granvella in the Council, and occasioned a furious storm of invective against him. The Estates rejected Philip's application, and the Regent decided to send to Madrid some person of influence, who should lay before the king the exact condition of the provinces. For this purpose the Lord of Montigny was selected. He was the brother of Horn, and friendly to the party of Orange. Philip, previously instructed by Granvella, received the envoy with kindness; but, beyond exculpating Granvella from all participation in the late obnoxious acts, the king gave but little satisfaction to Montigny, who, on his return, laid before the Council the slender results of his mission,—a report, which only excited indignation against the king. At this juncture, Orange, Horn, and Egmont, addressed the king by letter, informing him that the presence of Granvella was perilous to the royal power. Philip replied by complaining that no specifications had been made against the Cardinal, but invited one of them to come to Madrid and communicate with him, on the subject, by word of mouth. The same gentlemen sent a second letter to the king, and a remonstrance to the Regent, declaring that the measures of the government were so fatal to the interests of the country, that they could no longer take any part in the actions of the Council, and should abstain, in future, from attending it. The contents of this remonstrance were communicated to the king. The king consulted the Duke of Alva, who advised him to dissemble with the writers until he had them in his power, and then—"take off their heads!" Granvella, who was no stranger to the hostility of the nobles towards him, did not cease to accuse his enemies secretly to the king. But, the storm of execration against him was now so dreadful, that even *he* desired to quit the country. He was incessantly and mercilessly lampooned. The position which he had attained was coarsely contrasted with the lowness of his birth,—an accident which he

had certainly well redeemed. The nobles were enraged at the splendid state which he maintained. "The customs of Germany, the simple habiliments in which the retainers of the greatest houses were arrayed in that country, were contrasted with the tinsel and glitter in which the prelate pranked himself." The nobles, bent on exposing the Cardinal to the derision of the populace, arrayed themselves in a quaint garb of studied coarseness. Egmont was the first who adopted it—a measure for which he afterwards paid dear. "Doublet and hose of the coarsest grey, and long hanging sleeves, without gold or silver lace, and having but a single ornament, comprised the whole costume. An emblem which seemed to represent a monk's cowl, or a fool's cap and bells, was embroidered upon each sleeve. The device pointed at the Cardinal, as did, by contrast, the affected coarseness of the dress." The Cardinal, thus beset on all sides, was glad to leave the country.

(TO BE CONCLUDED.)

## ART. V.—RECENT INQUIRIES IN THEOLOGY EXAMINED.

RECENT INQUIRIES IN THEOLOGY. Second American, from the second London Edition. Edited, with an Introduction, by Rev. FREDERICK H. HEDGE, D. D. Boston : 1861.

THIS is indeed "*a very significant volume,*" as the Introduction states, and also a very remarkable production, as we shall attempt to show.

It comprises seven Essays, by seven distinguished scholars, theological and scientific, who, as we are notified, "have written without concert or comparison."

Several of these Essayists are public instructors at Oxford and other great seminaries of learning: most of them hold very prominent and responsible positions,—all, with one exception, are in Holy Orders in the Church of England; and all of them, without exception, are *freethinkers*, varying in degree from mitigated Rationalism to the rankest Infidelity.

Notwithstanding the special notice by the authors, that they "are responsible for their respective articles only," and have written in entire independence of each other, "without concert or comparison," and the assurance given by the editor, that these writers are "unconnected, save by the fellowship of a liberal faith," these Essays manifest a surprising *unity of design and execution*. The same mode and even vein of thought, the same cardinal principles pervade them all, and but for the differences of style and degrees of intensity, one would suppose them all to be the productions of one mind.

While each author chooses his own ground and mode of attack, the forces of all are marshalled with consummate skill, as if by a preconcerted plan against a common enemy. This common enemy is our English Bible, considered as the revealed Will of God and the inspired source of man's faith and practice.

One author, with apparent friendliness, enters a plea in behalf of the Sacred Scriptures as a valuable but *subordinate*

aid to conscience and reason, while others reject them entirely, as unnecessary, on the ground that reason is a sufficient guide to moral truth, and the laws of Nature a sufficient revelation of the Will of God. One qualifies away the Inspiration of the Bible, while others explain it away—or reject it entirely.

Two of these Essays seek to overthrow the genuineness and authenticity of the Scriptures, by a critical examination of its text and history, and by surreptitiously filching away its prophecies ; a third boldly tries to batter down the bulwarks of Divine Revelation, by leveling its artillery against Miracles ; a fourth artfully attempts to get rid of the Bible, by an improved theory of ideological interpretation, and its author, at the same time, traitorously seeks to sap the foundations of the Church which nurtures him ; a fifth Essay makes a fierce charge against the ignorance of Moses and the absurdity of his Cosmogony ; while a sixth is content to undermine the fountain of religious thought by the ordinary strategies of Rationalism. The Essay which makes the least direct onslaught on Revelation, is the one which stands first in the order of the series, and which is by far the least objectionable in outward form. This Essay presents a very interesting philosophical dissertation on the progressive education of the world from the time of its infancy, as depicted in Sacred History, to its vigorous manhood, as exemplified in our own day. This pleasing, but insidious production, from the pen of Dr. Temple, is eminently calculated to prepare the mind of the unsuspecting reader for the Rationalistic developments of the subsequent Essays, and for the Infidel conclusions to which they lead by an irresistible logic. We know not how this “new mode of thought” strikes a trained theological mind, but, as a simple layman, we consider Rationalism (so rife in our age of progressive reform) as the latest excuse and pretext which the Devil has furnished to intellectual Christians to enable them to become logically consistent and self-complacent Infidels. Hence, Dr. Temple, who was heretofore considered, and who still is, as the Bishop of London thinks, a pious presbyter of the Church of England, seems modestly aware that his restrained Rationalism *accuses* his Christianity. But the authors of the other six Essays seem

only anxious to *excuse* this Christianity, by a vain-glorious avowal of Rationalism.

Thoroughly imbued with what our Boston editor calls "*spiritual heroism*," but what we think would be more properly termed *carnal pride*, in the original dialect of his locality,—and certainly pride of reason in any latitude,—these spiritual enlighteners of a world long sitting in darkness, trusting to the infallible conclusions of their own reason, are confident, that by searching they can find out God to perfection, and solve all the mysteries of man's moral nature by—the aid of modern science.

Not fearing madly to "rush in where Angels dare not tread," they recklessly invade the Old Testament sanctuary of Divine Revelation, to despoil it of its sacred verities, and substitute their "new mode of thinking," as a surer guide to spiritual truth, a safer instructor in moral duty, and a more rational revelator of those mysteries which lie beyond the grave. Not stopping here, they lay violent hands on *supernatural* Christianity, and, by the false application of a proud human philosophy, they crucify that faith which, for 1800 years, has never yet failed to satisfy all the spiritual wants of those who have received it; which has always supplied every exigency of the soul in regard to time and eternity; and which challenges the world to produce one well attested case where it has failed to support the honest recipient during life, or where it has disappointed his hopes at the hour of death. Does there need any greater proof than this of its supernatural and Divine origin? But what do these seven

"Philosophers, who darken and put out  
Eternal truth by everlasting doubt,"

offer in exchange for this *well-tried* anchor of the soul? What is this new "principle or mode of thinking, which is to remedy the *unfelt* and *unrealized* "difficulties" and deficiencies of the old faith? The answer of all is best expressed in the language of one of them. It is "the growth and gradual diffusion through all religious thinking of the *supremacy of Reason*." The supremacy of reason applied to objects beyond its ken and far without the field of its vision! The ratiocination of

the human mind, that ignis fatuus of human pride, which received a fair trial for over 1800 years, from the time of Aristotle to the days of Bacon, and was found incapable of discovering a single truth ! Truly these seven are the men to whom Solomon referred, as those " who can render a reason," and it is greatly to be feared that wisdom will die with them.

So varied and divergent are the grounds and modes of their attacks upon Revelation. and so skilfully do these writers play into the hands of each other, that, while we are convinced it is the unity of design and the coöperation of all which gives power to the book as a whole, yet the authors would restrain us, in accordance with their significant caveat, from holding them jointly responsible. Thus, while no single champion, however skilled in theology or science, can be expected to contend successfully with all these different antagonists upon their own selected vantage ground, we are at the same time required to admit, in virtue of this unity, that unless all are refuted, no one of them is effectually defeated in his joint attack.

The exigencies of the case would seem to require, that in like manner with the assailants, seven defenders of the truth should also simultaneously arise, independently of each other, and unconnected, except by the bonds of a *true* faith, and each, with remarkable consentaneousness of action, be prepared to encounter and defeat his appropriate adversary. Upon this principle, this book would be very likely to prove an *unanswered* one, for it is not very probable that there will arise, fortuitously and simultaneously, a corresponding array of champions for the truth, all writing independently and unconnected with each other, and yet each having a perfect understanding of the part he is to take in the contest.

Conscious of our ability to bring home to these authors the charge of literary dishonesty in so many other respects, in their " free handling" of their subjects, in their references to Scripture, in their quotations of exploded opinions, in their special pleading, quibbling criticisms and unfair assumptions, we do not hesitate to say, that this plea of separate responsibility is what is termed, in the expressive Saxon of the day, " an artful dodge," to evade joint legal and official responsibility.



Their mutual agreement of fellowship in the production of this book by their separate labors, and their joint publication of it, are sufficient to impose on each a *moral responsibility* for the doctrines which it contains. Their *joint* moral responsibility is fully proved by their joint notice to the public, in which they commend "the volume," especially on the ground of its "free handling" of subjects.

Whatever conclusion the intelligent reader may come to, in regard to the unity of design and intention of these writers in thus preparing their separate Essays, as well adjusted parts of one whole,—there can be no doubt in regard to the intention of the Unitarian editor, in presenting their combined efforts to "all the Churches in our own land." His introduction leaves no room to doubt, that his intention was the promotion, in this country, of Rationalism, for the complete overthrow of what is known by the terms, Orthodox Christianity and Evangelical truth; and if these terms have their foundation in truth, then his aim is none other than the introduction of Infidelity, to the exclusion of true religion.

In full proof of this assertion, we quote his own admission, as contained in the following pithy apothegm. Speaking of this doctrine, which he eulogizes, he says, "*Rationalistic it is, inasmuch as it is Protestant, for of Rationalism, the only alternative is Romanism.*" Here he acknowledges two opposite extremes of doctrine, the first of which he adopts, rejecting all between. Now Romanism, on Protestant principles, (which he claims,) is *superstition*, the natural and necessary opposite to which is *Infidelity*. Therefore the necessary mean between these two extremes, is *true religion*; just as necessarily so, as that any virtue is the just mean between two opposite vices, or that any truth is the correct mean between two opposite errors. We thankfully accept the *mean* which he rejects, and leave him the *extreme* of his proper selection, which by his own admission is Infidelity.

But it does not need the aid of logic to fasten the charge of Infidelity on the book which he is introducing to the "American Churches." Under a flimsy and tattered veil of external Christianity, it presents the incarnation of Antichrist, breath-

ing the very spirit of Infidelity. Marks and notes of this abound on almost every page. There is not a single doctrine of the Christian man's belief that is not doubted or denied, sneered at or explained away. Excluding all question of matters purely Ecclesiastical, and allowing all due latitude for differences of opinion on doctrines esteemed *cardinal* by all bodies of Christians, we are still at a loss to conceive how any man, not an avowed Infidel, can carefully read this book, and then assent to the following prayer, with which Dr. Hedge closes his eulogy of its spirit and teaching. "*May this spirit, (he says,) which is now leavening the Church of England, find abundant entrance into all the Churches of our own land.*" To this prayer we respond from the depths of our soul, GOD FORBID!

It would far transcend the limits of this critique (as well as our ability) to expose in detail the errors of this "free handling" system, as they occur in each of these Essays. Such an undertaking would compel the necessity of reproducing all those unanswerable proofs of the authenticity of the Scriptures, and evidences of Christianity, which are as completely ignored in these Essays as if they had never been written. It would also impose on us the task of combatting many of those heresies of the early and Mediæval Church, as well as the Infidel opinions of the last century, which are as freely adopted and advanced by these modern reformers, as if they had never been exploded and abandoned.

We propose, however, to pass in very cursory review these seven Essays, in the order in which they are arranged in the book, for the purpose of introducing by name their authors to our readers, and of saying a few words in regard to certain fundamental principles, which are held in common by all: and then we propose to single out, from this array of Rationalistic assailants, some one antagonist, with whom it may be meet for a layman to break a lance in defence of the truth of God's Word.

Essay No. I. is entitled "The Education of the World." By Frederick Temple, D. D. A seemingly very appropriate subject for the Head Master of Rugby School—who holds also the offices (more honorary than responsible) of Chaplain in Ordinary to the Queen, and Chaplain to the Earl of Denbigh.

Dr. Temple is the intimate personal friend of the Bishop of London, who, in the Synod of the House of Bishops, now in session, offered a lame apology for him and Mr. Jowett, pleading delay of action in order that they might explain or disclaim, and "hoping, even against hope, that these individuals may return, however far they may have gone astray." His lame defence, inspired solely by personal friendship, immediately drew forth from the other Bishops individually the strongest expressions of reprobation against all the Essayists, without exception.

This Essay, as we have above remarked, is on its face the least objectionable of all, but is perhaps as dangerous as any, by its insidious preparation of the reader for the subsequent Infidel and even Atheistic developments. It forms an attractive portico to the extensive temple of Infidelity behind, in which every doctrine of the Christian religion is ruthlessly sacrificed on the altars of Reason and Science. The author, by the charms of a seductive though somewhat dreamy philosophy, lulls the suspicions of the uninitiated, and, in pleasant tones, encourages the inquisitive Christian to throw aside his childish superstition, and to offer at the shrine of reason a worship more becoming a man.

Dr. Temple may be styled, not derisively, but approximately and comparatively speaking, the *Chrysostom* of these seven reformers, who collectively have obtained in England the soubriquet of 'Septem contra Christum.' If he have not the glowing eloquence of him of the *Golden mouth*, he has the same fondness for imagery and figurative illustration, and he also partakes of his rich philosophic thought.

Under the figure, or rather allegory of the three successive ages of man's life, he depicts the history of the intellectual and moral development of the race, from infancy to what he calls "a colossal man." The first is the stage of childhood, which extended to the time of Christ, and was governed by an external "outer law," controlling the mind and enforcing obedience. The second is the stage of youth, commencing with Christ, which is an age of unreasoning impulse, governed

through its feelings and affections, and requiring the instruction of example.

The third stage ushers in the "colossal man" of our own day, who bows to no control except to the supremacy of reason.

"At this time, in the maturity of mankind, as with each man in the maturity of his powers, the great lever which moves the world is knowledge; the great force is the intellectual."—p. 55.

"The spirit, or conscience, (now,) as an accredited judge, invested with full powers, sits in the tribunal of our inner kingdom, decides upon the past and legislates upon the future, *without appeal except to himself*."—p. 36.

—"For now we are men, governed by principles, if governed at all, and cannot rely any longer on the impulses of youth or the discipline of childhood;"

with which words he closes his Essay.

We would here remark, that upon a second perusal of this Essay, after reading the subsequent ones, we found this prolonged allegory divested of a great deal of its fanciful philosophical dreaminess, and *invested with a great deal of suggestive significance*.

Does the reader ask "What becomes of the Bible under this 'free handling' system?" Dr. Temple answers; the Bible imposes on us no

"Permanent subjection to an outer law. It is a history; even the doctrinal parts of it are cast in a historical form, and are best studied by considering them as records of the time at which they were written, and as conveying to us the highest and greatest religious life of that time. Hence we use the Bible, some consciously, some unconsciously, not to override, but to evoke the voice of conscience."—p. 50.

"The Bible, in fact, is hindered by its form from exercising a despotism over the human spirit; if it could do that, it would become an *outer law* at once—it wins from us all the reverence of a supreme authority, and *yet imposes on us no yoke of subjection*. This it does by virtue of the principle of private judgment, which puts conscience between us and the Bible, making conscience the *supreme interpreter*, whom it may be a duty to enlighten, but whom it can never be a duty to disobey."—p. 51.

According to this teaching, there is no Divine revelation of an outer law to control man's faith and practice, to form his uninstructed conscience and guide his erring reason;—but, on the contrary, man finds within himself a higher law, which is not subject to an external revelation, but which subjects that revelation to his own internal conscience, formed and enlightened by his erring reason! What becomes of the command-

ments of the Decalogue, upon which the morality of the world and the statute books of all Christendom are founded? Let the above quoted words of Dr. Temple answer. "They are records of the time at which they were written—conveying to us the highest and greatest religious life of the time."

Can the present Head Master of Rugby school be a safe instructor of the élite of England's youth, and a fit successor to the illustrious Arnold!

By reading page 9, in connection with pages 36, 39 and 40, we obtain a clear idea of Dr. Temple's views of the relation which the external law of God, as contained in the Mosaic system, bears to man in the present state of the world's maturity.

"This system" (he says) "is a mixture of moral and positive commands.—No freedom of conduct or opinion is allowed.—That such commands should be sanctioned by Divine authority, is utterly irreconcilable with our present feelings." "But now the child has become a man." He is free, but still owes "obedience to rules, not indeed blind obedience to rules not understood, but *obedience to the rules of his own mind*, an obedience which he cannot throw off without descending below the childish level." "The law in fact which God makes the standard of our conduct, may have one of two forms. It may be an external law.—Or, again, the law may be an internal law;—a law, which is not imposed upon us by another power, but by our own enlightened will. Now the first of these is the law which governs and educates the child; the second, the law which governs and educates the man."

How different the estimation of God's law by the "child" David, and the "colossal man," Temple. The one says, "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet and a light to my path," and all who have tried it, wise or simple, have alike found it a safe guide to truth and virtue. The other tells us, on page 48, that we are "to trust to the conscience as the supreme guide," and therefore the Thug of India, adopting this "internal law," murders in perfect "obedience to the rules of his own mind, while the Rationalistic Divine of England steals the bread of life from the unlearned and simple, and starves him on the husks of his own "intellectual developments."

So much for the Law. All that our author says in regard to the Prophets may be found on page 10, with an occasional allusion elsewhere. He considers them mere commentators on the law—appealing to the conscience of the individual, just emerg-

ing from the childhood of the world into budding youth. He alludes to the Hebrew prophets in the same connection with Gibbon, Bacon and Aristotle, as "great writers," who have contributed to the education of the world. The "predictive element" of their writings, which miraculously attests the divinity of an external law and the advent of a spiritual Deliverer, he entirely ignores. In fact, he considers the whole system of the Hebrews as containing "very little directly spiritual," and that little, confined to their own times. Its chief results and value is, the introduction of two "cardinal points of education, viz., monotheism and chastity. The conviction of the unity and spirituality of God was peculiar to the Jews among the pioneers of civilization;" but he immediately adds, "Greek philosophers had, no doubt, come to the same conclusion by dint of reason." From this spirituality he deduces,

"The supremacy of conscience, the immortality of the soul, the final judgment of the human race; for (mark well the words) *we know the other world and can only know it, by analogy drawn from our own experience.*"—*pp.* 13 to 16.

He thus summarily rejects all external Divine revelation in regard to another world, and leaves man to grope after the *spiritual*, under the supreme guidance of his own spirit or conscience,—to explore the supernatural by the sole aid of his own natural powers, and to come to the same vague conclusions with the Greek philosophers, by "dint of reason." St. Paul tells us, "the world by wisdom knew not God;" but in Dr. Temple's school of the world's development, St. Paul is but a promising *youth*; the Essayists are the *men*.

Having thus disposed of the Law and the Prophets, the reader may be anxious to know how he deals with the Gospel. His views in regard to the Divine Redeemer and the Faith which His Apostles have handed down through the Church to our own times, may be gathered from the following extracts:

"The period of youth, in the history of the world, corresponds (says Dr. Temple) to the meeting point of the Law and the Gospel."

This period he minutely describes as an age of impulse, feeling and emotion, prone to exaggeration, levity and folly. It is an age requiring the teaching of example.

"The second stage, therefore, in the education of man, was the presence of our Lord upon earth," whose life "we emphatically call the Gospel."—"Our Lord was the Example of mankind," but, he adds, "Our Lord's presence was not the only influence of that kind which has acted on the human race."

Three other educators were appointed, Greece, Rome, and the early Church.

"But the one Example of all examples came, in the fulness of time, just when the world was fitted to feel the power of His presence. Had His revelation been delayed until now, assuredly it would have been hard for us to have recognized His divinity; for the faculty of faith has now turned inwards, and *cannot now accept any outer manifestations of the truth of God.*"—"If we have lost that freshness of faith which would be the first to say to a poor carpenter, 'Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,' yet we possess, in the greater cultivation of our religious understanding, that which, perhaps, we ought *not to be willing to give in exchange.*"

Our Essayist coolly remarks of those who had this "Example set before them,"—"that we know better than they the precise outlines of the truth."

He goes on audaciously to assert, of those who had heard from our Lord's lips of the empire over man's heart of the great Adversary, whom he styles the "prince of this world," that "they had not the same clearness of understanding as we; the same recognition that it is God and not the Devil who rules the world."

"Had our Lord come later, He would have come to mankind already beginning to stiffen into the fixedness of maturity," (of the colossal man.) "The power of His life would not have sunk so deeply into the world's heart, *the truth of His divine nature would not have been recognized*; seeing the Lord would not have been the title to Apostleship." Again—"Our vision of the Son of God is now aided by the eyes of the Apostles, and by that aid we can recognize the express image of the Father.—But in this, we are like men who are led through unknown woods by Indian guides." These extracts are all from one section, on pages 28 and 29.

There is not the slightest recognition, by this writer, of Jesus Christ as the Divine Messiah, nor do the terms Redeemer or Saviour occur in the Essay. Our Lord was a mere man, who aided the instruction of the race, purely by the example of His life. The four times repeated history of His life, which is emphatically termed the Gospel, contain little "to be technically called doctrine;" His success and reputation as a Divine teacher was due to the affectionate ignorance and impressionable feelings of His pupils in this age of the world's youth.



This is the condensed but truthful expression of this Gospel preacher's views in regard to the Saviour of mankind, and it irresistibly suggests the inference, that had he lived during the days of the Saviour, with his present maturity of religious understanding, he would undoubtedly have denied the Divinity of "Our Lord." In fact, he would have found the whole body of learned Rabbis and Doctors of Divinity sympathizing with him on his own principles of supremacy of conscience and reason—and triumphantly exclaiming, "Have any of the rulers or of the Pharisees believed on him? But this people who *knoweth not the law* are cursed." Surely, Dr. Temple, despite your assertion of the world's youth, there were men in those days as colossal as yourself!

Let us next see what our Essayist thinks of the Church. By the term "Early Church," he refers to that under the personal guidance of the Apostles, whose institution and faith is revealed to us in the New Testament, but which our author assures us contains no creeds, "nor doctrines logically stated."

The New Testament (he says) is almost entirely occupied with two lives—the life of our Lord and the life of the Early Church. Among the Epistles there are but two which seem, even at first sight, to be treatises for the future, instead of letters for the time,—the Epistle to the Romans and the Epistle to the Hebrews; and even these, when closely examined, appear, like the rest, to be no more than the fruit of the current history. "*That Early Church does not give us precepts, but an example.*" Again—"Had she legislated peremptorily for posterity, her legislation must have been set aside—but her example will live and teach forever."—pp. 32, 33. "She, too, had her faults,—disorders, violent quarrels, licentious recklessness of opinion, both in regard to faith and practice."—p. 34.

In order fully to estimate the disguised but deadly hostility of this attack, let it be remembered, that this grievous charge is not made in reference to those errors and irregularities of early Christian converts, which are so severely rebuked in the New Testament, but it is made against that early Apostolic Church, the first and purest embodiment of the teachings of Christ, which was represented by the Apostles themselves, all

of whom claimed to be the divinely appointed and divinely inspired exponents of the one true Faith of Christ.

A single extract will suffice to present Dr. Temple's sentiments in regard to the Church of the Fathers, and the Creed which has come down to us ; to wit :

"We can acknowledge the great value of the forms in which the first ages of the Church defined the truth, and yet refuse to be bound by them ; we can use them, and yet endeavor to go beyond them, just as they also went beyond the legacy which was left us by the Apostles."—*p.* 50.

This means, in plain English, that we have just as good right to depart from the Faith of the Fathers, as they had from what we assume was the Faith of the Apostles, and, a fortiori, a still greater right to depart from the Faith of the Church of England. We can, therefore, use her forms and yet refuse to be bound by her Creed—we can "eat her bread and throw her doctrine to the winds in scorn."

Dr. Temple's Essay is certainly the least objectionable, in its external aspect, of the seven contained in this remarkable book. By its professed regard for the Bible, and by its pleasant tone of friendliness, it strikes the mind of a cursory reader as refreshingly orthodox, compared with the outbreking Infidelity of certain of the others. Besides, the figurative mould, in which is cast a rich vein of philosophic thought on a subject admitting of such speculation, naturally disarms the mind of suspicion, and we are inclined to attribute what seems objectionable, to the necessities of the allegory. Or if, occasionally, suspicion be fairly aroused, it is adroitly lulled by an ambiguous explanation, or soothed by an accompanying note of praise. But when this Essay is narrowly scanned, its true character is revealed, and the more carefully it is studied, the more dangerous does it appear, from its insidious and jesuitical "free handling." We are startled to find, that what we at first considered the overwrought fancifulness of a dreamy philosophy, is replete with most dangerous practical significance. We are also painfully impressed with the conviction, that this Essay has been carefully prepared with direct reference to a preconcerted plan, arranged with the authors of the other Essays. It maps out a plan of the campaign, and contains the secret or-

ders which others execute, while Dr. Jowett is stationed in the rear, to cut off from the beleagured all chance of escape. In this Essay are scattered, broadcast, the minute germs of the new mode of Infidel thought, which spring up, blossom and bear fruit in the succeeding Essays. To borrow a figure from the progressive-development theory, of which all these authors seem very fond, it might be said, that the Essay of Dr. Temple produces the embryotic monad, which the succeeding Essayists develop rapidly into a colossal Deist, and put him to a practical use in Church and State.

Essay No. 2 is by Rowland Williams, D. D., Vice Principal of Lampeter College, Vicar of Broad Chalke.

The ostensible object of this contribution is to review and applaud the Biblical researches of Baron Bunsen : its real object is to overthrow the validity of the Scriptures and of every doctrine of the Christian Faith.

The cowardly disingenuousness, with which the author seeks to accomplish this purpose, by skulking behind the opinions of another, excites disgust ; but the hypocritical meanness, with which he gives *ambiguous* expression to his own Infidel sentiments, couched in evangelical terms, must produce, in every honest Christian heart, detestation for the disciple who thus betrays his Master with a kiss.

This production is styled a Review, but, in every sense of the word, it is an Essay ; an Essay to poison the fountain of religious thought, and to introduce with eulogy, the laborious Rationalism of a German statesman, who, after retiring from public affairs, true to the *rag and bone collecting* instincts of his plodding race, has amused his declining years by delving among the fossils of a pre-historic age, to collect materials wherewith to build, with profound erudition, absurd *card houses* for a fanciful Infidelity.

The tone and spirit of this Essay is open to the severest criticism. Its disingenuousness and *persiflage* startle us at every step, like the hissing of a coiled snake, while the pervading affectation of a soi-disant "robust scholarship," offends by its savor of vain-glorious pedantry and sciolism. In the unvarnished language of a blunt Christian layman, this Essay

might be very aptly characterized, as the underhand effort of a conceited Welch clergyman to overthrow the faith of the English Church, by substituting the theological lucubrations of a retired German statesman.

Such an effort would seem an insignificant and futile attempt, but it acquires a grave importance, when we consider, that to its author has been confided the responsible charge of training young clergymen, at St. David's College, for preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ, according to the doctrines of the Reformed Church of England.

It is fortunate, however, that the trainer himself is under the Ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Bishop of Salisbury, who, in common with all the other English Bishops, unqualifiedly condemns these Essays, and at the Canterbury Convention, now in session, speaks of Dr. Williams as one, who "has been the cause of so much scandal and anxiety in (his) Diocese."

In reference to this Essay, the Bishop says ; "I have already sought legal advice as to whether the teaching of one of the Essays is *so worded* as to justify my carrying the matter into Court." This statement explains a very striking characteristic in the style of Dr. Williams, and in his manner of dealing with subjects. It accounts for his obscure and involved sentences, for his ambiguous phraseology, in which he blends with a studied confusion his own views with those of the author he revises ; his deceptive use of evangelical terms in an Infidel sense ; and his constant suggestions that such and such Infidel doctrines might be logically deduced from the opinions of the author he eulogises—with the remark, that there would seem to be no escape from such conclusions, without falling into greater errors.

It is very evident, that the Vice Principal of Lampeter and Vicar of Broad Chalke writes with the fear of his Diocesan before his eyes, and that he studies with ingenious obscurity to word his "free handling" of matters of Faith, so that he may avail himself of a quibble to escape the condemnation of the Court. The moral obliquity and cowardice of the author is fully exemplified by the literary dishonesty of his production. Instead of plunging with honest boldness into the cold, dark

waters of Infidelity, he stands shivering on the brink, or attempts to wade across them safely, on the shoulders of his German ally. We doubt whether this quibbling subterfuge will avail to screen him from legal responsibility, and it is certainly a plea which will not be admitted by any intelligent and honest reader of his Review ;—for it is perfectly apparent that he not only cordially adopts all the Infidelity that he can possibly squeeze out of old Bunsen, but that he also labors with consummate artifice to make that Infidelity effective for the overthrow of revealed religion.

The following is a concise synopsis of the theological views, which this trainer of young clergymen would fain see introduced into the Church of England,—stated as nearly as possible in his own words.

1st.—The Bible is the written voice of the congregation (p. 87) ; the repressive idea of an external revelation is an *unbearable* fiction, (p. 103.)

The Mosaic account is half ideal, and half traditional, and is to be relegated to the domain of legend, or symbol (p. 64) ; the sacrifice of Isaac was an example of the fierce ritual of Syria, and Abraham's *faith* consisted in *disobeying* this ritual (p. 69) ; the Avenging Angel of the Passover was probably a Bedouin host, and the passage of the Red Sea belongs to the latitude of poetry (p. 67.) The Pentateuch (p. 67) ; the books of Job and Jonah (p. 70) ; of Zechariah (p. 76) ; of Daniel (p. 85) ; the Epistle to the Hebrews, and the second of the *Petrine Epistles* (p. 94)—*are all more or less spurious*. A "remorseless criticism" must decide what is genuine and what is spurious in the Canon of Scripture ; the evidences of our Canonical Books are not adequate to *guarantee narratives inherently incredible, or precepts evidently wrong* (p. 92) ; the inspiration of the sacred writers is no different from that of Luther and Milton, and we are obliged to assume in ourselves a *verifying faculty* in regard to matters of faith and conscience.

2dly.—Our author's views in regard to Miracles are as follows : Questions of Miraculous interference which violates our conceptions of physical law as unbroken, must abide by verdicts on the age of records, bearing in mind the distinction be-

tween poetry and prose, and the possibility of imagination allying itself with affection (p. 58.) The idea of an irrational superstition is to be scouted, and a rationalizing criticism traces *revelation* historically within the sphere of nature and humanity (Note, p. 59.) Our Deluge takes its place among geological phenomena (p. 63.) If we would accept a Miracle, it should be for its *moral lesson*, as the ethical element is what is fundamental (p. 58); Christ's appeal was to *good* works, and he thus taught us to have faith mainly in goodness. (p. 59.)

But a direct attack on Miracles proper was not the allotted task of this Essayist, this being assigned to another co-laborer. His speciality in this department is Prophecy. The Prophecies, according to him, are not historical riddles, as is generally supposed, but they are mere *moral lessons*,—tracts for the times. He tells us, with great truth, that it would require from most Englishmen years of study to understand Bunsen on this head. (p. 72.) The Miraculous predictive element, whether secular or Messianic, is an untenable fallacy (p. 75); and he gently, but ungratefully, chides his protecting German Mentor for supposing, that there might be some kind of *clairvoyance* in the matter, consistent, however, with fallibility (p. 79.) Isaiah's striking prophecies refer not to Christ, but are a record of Jeremiah's sufferings (p. 81 and 82.) After making what he calls a vast induction on the destructive side, by the application of his remorseless rationalistic (verbal) criticism, and his verifying faculty, he informs us that there are just two doubtful Messianic prophecies, and that these are already being melted in the crucible of searching inquiry (p. 78.) The use of "Sagan for officers," and "Aphil for Hiphil," is sufficient to impeach the authenticity of Isaiah; while the change of the pronominal  $\text{נ}$  and  $\text{א}$  into  $\text{א}$ , is the argument against the genuineness of Daniel (p. 85.) The Apocalypse is a series of poetical visions, referring solely to Jerusalem, then threatened by Vespasian.

3dly.—The following are the views of Christ, and Gospel doctrine, (expressed in his own language,) which our Essayist commends through the mouth of Bunsen.

"Jesus Christ is the human expression of the Divine Will, and in Him he finds brought to perfection, that religious idea which is the thought of the Eternal (p.



87.) The Incarnation is purely spiritual. The son of David by birth is the son of God by the spirit of holiness (p. 92.) The doctrine of the Trinity, with the Fathers, was a metaphysical problem, which has become a materialism almost idolatrous, or an arithmetical enigma (p. 97.) Its true philosophical basis is the law of Thought identified with Being.—The expressions of a Triad may be represented as will, wisdom and love; as mind, thought and consciousness; as person, word and life; as Father, Son, and Spirit.—The primitive Trinity represented neither three originant principles, nor three transient phases, but three eternal inherencies in one Divine mind. The unity of God as the Eternal Father is the fundamental doctrine of Christianity. (p. 99.)

Christ is the moral Saviour of mankind. Justification by faith means, peace of mind, not a fiction of merit by transfer (p. 90.) Regeneration is an awakening of the forces of the soul; Resurrection means a spiritual quickening; Salvation is deliverance from evil; Propitiation is the recovery of peace.—The hateful fires of Gehenna may serve as images of distracted remorse. Heaven is not a place so much as fulfilment of the love of God. (p. 91.)

The above doctrinal views are not the fairly expressed sentiments of his author, and quoted by our Essayist for the purpose of reprobation—but he *wrings* them out of Bunsen, in order to laud, defend and fortify them by interlarding them with his own ambiguous expressions, and by deceptive allusions to the opinions of able writers. He claims that his author understands St. Paul reasonably, and that he is not bound to repeat traditional fictions about our Canons (of Scripture,) or to *read its pages with that dullness which turns symbol and poetry into materialism*. He devotes the concluding pages of his Essay to a labored defence and eulogy of his Magnus Apollo, and he considers any points disputable or partially erroneous, in his many works, as dust in the balance.

4thly.—Our Essayist's opinion of the Early Church and its transmitted Doctrine, may be briefly expressed in his words, as

"The fresh language of feeling or symbol being transferred to the domain of logic, like Homer turned into prose by a scholiast."—p. 95. "While they (who appeal to antiquity) imagine a system of divine immutability, or one in which at worst, holy Fathers unfolded, reverently, Apostolic oracles, the true history of the Church exhibits the turbulent growth of youth; a democracy with all its passions, transforming itself into sacerdotalism, and a poetry with its figures partly represented by doctrine and partly perverted."—p. 96.

We propose to make only two or three brief comments upon the theological doctrines of this trainer of the young clergy.

First.—His fundamental idea in regard to Revelation is, that it is the religious sentiment of the mass at any given time,



"For the Bible (he says) is, before all things, the written voice of the congregation." In other words, he substitutes for the inspired Word of God, the old Latin satire, "*vox populi vox Dei*." Now the experience of all mankind, in its most enlightened state, as depicted in the history of every country, particularly our own, accords with the statement of Holy Writ, to prove that the maxim, *vox populi vox demonis*! is the exact expression of the truth. The acknowledged fact, corroborated by each man's individual experience, as well as by the teachings of Scripture, that the mass of mankind are naturally inclined to vice rather than virtue, and that the unregenerated human heart is desperately wicked, bespeaks the necessity for an external revelation, which shall control its natural impulses.

Secondly.—If a well-attested instance of a fulfilled prophecy could be adduced, his whole theological fabric would tumble down—for in that case it could be proved, that the voice of God had supernaturally spoken through an inspired mouth.—Hence it becomes a prime object with him to destroy the Prophets, especially Isaiah and Daniel. But how does he accomplish this feat? He disposes of them by critical philology, the most uncertain of all tests, even when applied to a living tongue by the ablest hands,—but in his, it amounts to a verbal criticism of a comparatively obsolete language, so quibbling, that, if he had applied the same to his native Welch, which he doubtless understands better than either the Chaldaic or Hebrew, "his countrymen would have raised a storm of ridicule at which he must have drowned himself," not "in the Neckar," but in the Dee or Severn.

He also disposes summarily of "the second of the Petrine Epistles," with the same weapon.—In this case we infer that he had an additional and personal reason for hostility—for it contains a Prophecy which fits exactly the Vice Principal of Lampeter and his fellow Essayists. It is the following. "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, even denying the Lord that bought them, and bring upon themselves swift destruction."

Essay No. 3 is on the Study of the Evidences of Christianity.  
VOL. XVI.—NO. II.

ity. By Baden Powell, M. A., F. R. S., and Professor of Geometry in the University of Oxford. It is refreshing, after dealing with the disingenuous obscurity and *cuttle-fish* propensities of the preceding writer, to meet one who with honest, frank candor, tells you plainly what he means, and avowing, with manly independence, his own Infidelity, seeks openly to rob us of our faith in Revelation by a desperate assault on its Miracles. We can respect a man who, single-handed, in open day, assaults or robs us, but not one who filches in the dark, with the aid of a pal.

This Essay is, for the most part, an argumentative discussion and review of the opinions of others in regard to the evidence and credibility of Miracles—with a destructive intention. We propose to shew that it contains many bold assertions, much sophistry, and no logical argument.

Its disbelief, which is positive, not sceptical, is of so rank a character, that it requires no small charity to call it Deism. Were it not for a single allusion to an "all-pervading Supreme Intelligence," (which, nevertheless, admits of a Pantheistic interpretation,) we would not hesitate to call it blank Atheism.

Its author seems to recognize no God but physical law—to worship at no shrine but Science—and to acknowledge no inspired revelator of Divine truth but human reason.

His confession of faith would appear to be limited to a belief in the supremacy of the immutable, "eternally impressed," "self-sustaining and self-evolving powers, that pervade all nature." The idea of a *positive, external, divine* revelation is scouted—creation, and the Omnipotence of God, all but denied—and the absurd hypothesis of spontaneous generation, all but adopted. He argues for the "dissociation of the spiritual from the physical," and would fain discard the Creator from His own works, and depose Him from all control over His own laws. Hear him :

"More recently, the antiquity of the human race, and the development of species, and the rejection of the idea of 'creation,' have caused new advances in the same direction" of the above dissociation.—p. 145. Again. "In an age of physical research, like the present, all highly cultivated minds—recognize the impossibility of any modification whatsoever in the existing conditions of material agents, unless through the invariable operation of a series of *eternally impressed* consequences,

following in some necessary chain of orderly connection, however imperfectly known to us."—p. 150. Again. "Yet it is now acknowledged, under the high sanction of the name of Owen, (?) that "creation" is only another name for our ignorance of the mode of production; and it has been the unanswered and unanswerable argument of another reasoner, that new species *must* have originated *either* out of their inorganic element, or out of previously organized forms; *either* development or spontaneous generation *must* be true; while a work has now appeared by a naturalist of the most acknowledged authority,—Mr. Darwin's masterly volume, on the "Origin of species" by the law of "natural selection," which now substantiates, on undeniable grounds, the very principle so long denounced by the first naturalists,—*the origination of new species by natural causes*; a work which must soon bring about an entire revolution in favor of the grand principle of the self-evolving powers of nature"—p. 157. (the italics are his.) And then listen to this. "The Divine Omnipotence is entirely an inference *from the language of the Bible*, adopted on the assumption of a belief in revelation."—p. 128. (The italics are his own.)

Such is, or rather was, the creed of one whom the American Editor styles the *ablest advocate of liberal theology in the Church of England*. It is sad to think that this Essay was his latest advocacy of such *theology*, before death summoned him to test the realities of that Revelation which his proud reason scorned. Could the grave shroud from sight his living words, as it does his mortal remains, we would gladly avail ourselves of the maxim—'de mortuis nil nisi bonum.'

The object of this Essay is, to prove that Miracles lend no support whatever to Christianity, and the author emphasizes with italics his own case when he says, "Thus, if Miracles were, in the estimation of a former (ignorant) age, among the chief *supports* of Christianity, they are at present among the main difficulties and *hindrances* to its acceptance."—p. 158. His views may be summed up under two heads, using his own words.

1st.—He considers Miracles totally unworthy of the belief of men of science, inasmuch as they are inconceivable violations of the immutable and *eternally impressed* laws of nature, which no power can alter—and are beyond the reach of any kind of evidence;—but he allows that they may have been considered *evidential*, by an ignorant age, capable of being deceived by them.—

"No testimony can reach to the supernatural"—p. 121—any phenomenon attributed "to supernatural causes is entirely dependent on the *powers of belief* and as-

*sumptions* of the parties.—p. 121. "The entire range of the inductive philosophy is at once based upon, and in every instance tends to confirm, by immense accumulation of evidence, the grand truth of the universal order and constancy of natural causes, as a *primary law of belief*."—p. 123. "The enlarged critical and inductive study of the natural world, cannot but tend powerfully to evince the *inconceivableness* of imagined interruptions of natural order, or *supposed* suspensions of the laws of matter."—p. 124. "The evidential force of Miracles (to whatever it may amount) is wholly *relative* to the apprehensions of the party addressed" and may be evidential as regards them, though we are "able to explain what, in an *ignorant age*, was regarded as a Miracle."—p. 130.

And now mark the climax :

"In nature, and from nature, by science and by reason, we neither have, nor can possibly have, any evidence of a *Deity working Miracles*,—for that, we must go out of nature, and beyond reason."—p. 160.

Therefore (the above assertions being true) our Saviour must have been an impostor, since he so often appealed to his acknowledged power of *controlling the Laws of Nature*, in proof of his Divinity, and cites specially to the disciples of John his power to *raise the dead* ;—He must also have been a juggler of inconceivable dexterity, since he, so often and in so many ways deceived, by pretended Miracles, not only the Scribes and Pharisees, who were jealously watching him, but the whole nation. The Jews also must have been right when they accused him of blasphemy in pretending to forgive sins, for, they argued with truth, that none but God could forgive sins—and though they could not deny His Miracles, they were justified in attributing them to the Devil, who, they believed, *had* the power to violate the Laws of Nature ! There is no escape from this consequence, for the Saviour *distinctly claimed* the power to control and interrupt the order and the Laws of Nature,—while our author asserts that such power is not only inconceivable, but that even the evidence of a Deity (whose Omnipotence he doubts) working Miracles is an impossibility.

2dly.—The second head, under which the views of this Essay may be classed, refers to the value of Miracles as an external attestation of the truth of Christianity. The author labors to shew, that, if Miracles were possible and could be proved, they would be of no value to religion—but he is willing to "admit that what is not a subject for a problem, *may hold its place in a creed*." He scrutinizes what he terms, "the evidential argu-

ment" of "the champions of the evidences of Christianity." He cites the opinions of numbers of these champions, of different schools, to show that they more or less discard the external attestation of Miracles, and rely on the moral argument,—or doctrine,—and these citations are not always made with fairness. Thus he quotes Coleridge so as to present him in destructive antagonism to Paley—conveying the idea, that the former rejects a *belief* in Miracles,—whereas it is notorious that such is not the fact; but, in the exuberance of his faith in the sufficiency of the *internal* evidence of Christianity, Coleridge criticises Paley for laying so much stress on its *external attestation*. Our author takes a similar liberty with Trench and with his kinsman Whately.

The gist of his argument is, the supremacy of Reason in the discovery and verification of every thing that we can receive as truth. We will quote a few passages in illustration of the above second head.

"The main ground of the admissibility of external attestations is, the worthiness of their object,—*the doctrine*."—p. 137. "Yet, what is it, but to acknowledge the right of an appeal superior to that of all Miracles, *to our own moral tribunal*; to the principle that 'the human mind is competent to sit in moral and spiritual tribunal on a professed revelation?' "—p. 138. "After all, the evidential argument has but little actual weight with the generality of believers."—p. 145. "The Pharisees set down the Miracles of Christ to the power of evil spirits, and in other cases no conviction was produced, *not even in the Apostles*. Even Nicodemus, notwithstanding his logical reasoning, was but half convinced; while Jesus himself, *especially to his disciples in private*, referred to His works as only secondary and subsidiary to the higher evidence of His character and doctrine."—p. 131. "But the particular case of Miracles, as such, is one specially bearing on purely physical contemplation, and on which no general moral principles, no common rules of evidence or logical technicalities can enable us to form a correct judgment."—p. 150.

And now mark well what follows :

"Testimony, after all, is but a second-hand assurance, it is but a blind guide ; testimony can avail nothing against reason. —It is not the *mere fact*, (of the Miracle,) but the *cause* or *explanation* of it, which is the point at issue."—p. 159.

The reasoning of this Essay is sophistical from beginning to end. It is one grand involved *petitio principii*. Let us examine it. The author is arguing against those "Christian champions," who appeal to Miracles as attestations of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and of the Divine inspiration of that *positive*

external revelation, which has come down to us through the Apostles.

Our author claims, that the "mere fact", of Miraculous agency is not the question, but that it is "*the cause or explanation of it*," which is the point at issue.

We accept the issue. According to the Christian believer, "*the cause or explanation*" of Miracles is the exertion of that Divine power which created the universe. The Christian claims that the "*τίερα*" and "*σημεία*" "*prodigies*" and "*signs*" of the New Testament, were truly supernatural interferences of the Deity—and not, as our author insinuates, "*θαυμάσια μύθοις*," juggling wonders for fools. The Christian holds that no power but that of God Who created, can violate, suspend, or interrupt the natural order of creation. That the Author of law can alone control law—and that no man nor Devil can wield this power. Therefore Miracles, which are interruptions of the usual order and laws of Nature, *must* visibly manifest, and incontestably prove, the supernatural interference of the Deity.

How does the author of this Essay meet this explanation, which is the issue he makes? He *assumes* that the laws of Nature are, under all circumstances, immutable. That no *possible* interference with them is *conceivable*, and that no power can interrupt, alter, or suspend them. This is his major premise, and is an assumption of the question, since the issue he proposes is not the impossibility of Miracles, but the *cause or explanation* of Miracles, which both parties admit to be interruptions of the laws of Nature. In order to prove that his opponent's explanation of them is untenable, he labors to show that Miracles are impossible, *because* they are interruptions of the laws of Nature, which nobody denies and which is not the point in dispute. He thus continually appeals to his assumed premises in proof of his conclusion—to wit: the impossibility of Miracles, although the issue he demands is, their cause or explanation. The Christian proposition, which he attempts to controvert, is this:—the *occurrence* of those interruptions of the laws of Nature, which are termed Miracles, attests the interference of an Omnipotent Creator.

In this proposition, the occurrence of interruptions of the laws of Nature is the subject, and Divine interference is the predicate.

The argument, expressed syllogistically, is as follows :

1st.—None but an Omnipotent Creator can interrupt the laws of His creation.

2d.—Miracles are interruptions of the laws of Creation.

3d.—Therefore Miracles attest the interference of an Omnipotent Creator.

In order to controvert the above proposition, our author's reasoning runs thus :

1st.—The laws of Nature are immutable, and cannot be interrupted.

2d.—Miracles (*when they occur*) are interruptions of these laws.

3d.—Therefore Miracles (*when they occur*) are impossible.

This syllogism might answer, if his major premise were granted, and if the point at issue were the *impossibility* of Miracles ; but it becomes an absurdity when applied, as by the words in parenthesis, to the proposition he attempts to controvert, to wit ; “the *occurrence* of Miracles is evidential of Divine interference.”

It is perfectly apparent that the true point at issue is the “mere fact” of the occurrence of Miracles, and that fact can only be settled by evidence. *Did Christ really work Miracles?* This is the true question.

If Christ, by an *inherent* power, and in His own name, commanded, with the uplifted “finger of God,” the powers of darkness and of Nature, and they obeyed Him,—then did He give the necessary proof that He was very God.

If by a *derived* power, in the name of God, Christ and His Apostles worked the same Miracles, then did they give assurance of a supernatural interference of the Deity, and they thus furnished those credentials of a Divine Revelation, which the human reason imperatively demands, and which is based upon a true statement of our author's assumption, to wit : that none but the Author of creation can control its laws.

But if, on the other hand, Christ and His Apostles did not



really work Miracles, but only "good works, however wonderful," which deceived "an ignorant age," then were both He and they arrant impostors; for they constantly, and in express terms, claim the power which our author asserts is not only impossible but inconceivable.—There is no escape from this dilemma, and the partisans of this liberal school of theology are welcome to either horn.

Hence, we repeat, it is perfectly apparent, that the whole controversy turns upon the question of the "mere fact," to be settled by evidence.

But our author asserts, that "no testimony can reach to the supernatural." Spiritual doctrine may be believed, but can never be proved—it "may hold its place in a creed"—but not in the records of truth. If, by the above assertion, he means that the human reason cannot, by the aid of "inductive philosophy," explore "the boundless region of spiritual things, which is the sole dominion of *faith*," therein to collect facts with which to fathom and explain the counsels of the Almighty, so that they shall be satisfactory to the "verifying faculties" of these Essayists—then do we perfectly agree with him. He has sententiously expressed a self-evident platitude. But if he means to say, that the Almighty cannot possibly make such a supernatural revelation of Himself, as the human mind can recognize and verify; that He cannot interfere with His own works, or suspend His own laws, in order to satisfy those spiritual wants of the soul, which, by our author's own showing, reason can never supply;—then, we assert, that he has uttered a falsehood equally insulting to the power of God, and to the reason of man, and in proof of our assertion we appeal to the evidence of the *fact*.

The 4th Essay is entitled "*Séances Historiques de Genève*."—The National Church. By Henry Bristow Wilson, B. D. Vicar of Great Staughton.

The task assigned to, or assumed by, the Vicar of Great Staughton, in this fellowship of Essays, is an attack on dogmatic history, with a view covertly to undermine the doctrinal teachings of the Church at large, and to overthrow, in particular, the Establishment of the English Church. This allotted,

or this voluntary task, as the case may be, embraces also the attempt to *sap*, whenever opportunity presents, the foundations of all religious, Bible Faith, whatsoever.

The above title indicates a Review of the sittings of certain ecclesiastico-literary debaters, recently held in the city of Geneva. Our Essayist informs us, on the opening page, that "the attention of the hearers was to be conciliated by the concrete form of these discourses ;—*while, from time to time, as occasion offered, the more peculiar views of the speakers were to be instilled.*" The above remark of our author is an *exact* delineation of his own proposed tactics.

The titular indication of a Review is a sheer pretence, a *blind*, to direct attention from the *animus* of the Essay. The author gives but a very passing notice to these Genevan *litterateurs*, and that, solely for the purpose of extracting from their quiddities the phraseology of two of their terms, of which he avails himself to instill his own peculiar views. These terms are "*Individualism*," and "*Multitudinism*." By Individualism, is understood a Church composed of individual Christians, who, believing that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, have each, from that source, come "to know and believe in Jesus," and hold "the faith once delivered to the saints" to be necessary to salvation, on the ground of its Divine inspiration, which our author pronounces to be an "assumption."—p. 196.

This Individualist idea in regard to Church, Faith, and Salvation, the Vicar of Staughton opposes, *totis viribus*, in behalf of "the negative Theologian ;" but he cordially adopts the Multitudinist principle, which claims, that men are best converted (as under Constantine) by the secular power, and "Christianized, en masse." "A national Church (which he hopes to see founded on this principle) need not, historically speaking, be Christian." It is sufficient that its members nominally profess and call themselves Christian. The Vicar thinks it should rightfully embrace all sorts of people. "Christians of Sadducee prejudices," doubting a spiritual existence and the resurrection of the dead, should not be rejected, nor should "a notoriously immoral person—be refused the name

of brother, or Christian."—see pp. 181 to 185. He claims "that each one born into the nation is, together with his civil rights, born into a membership—to a spiritual society."—p. 218. Such a National Multitudinist Church, would be the Church of the *world*, not of Christ; deprived of an external Divine Revelation, which all the Essayists reject, and adopting for its Bible "the voice of the congregation," it would soon become the Synagogue of the Devil.

Each of these Essayists has his own method of getting rid of the Bible. Mr. Wilson's plan is, perhaps, the most ingenious, as it certainly is the most Jesuitical and dishonest. He demolishes it by interpreting it. He considers it an excess of dullness, to take, "as if they were literally facts, all the particulars of a wonderful history, because, in some sense, it is from God." He explains them by '*ideological exegesis*.' He regrets that so many of his countrymen are educated "by the reading of the Scriptures," without the attempt on the part of learned men "to accompany the reading with the safe-guard of a reasonable interpretation," to enable them to distinguish "between the dark patches of human passion and error, and the bright center of spiritual truth within."—p. 199.

The Scripture writers, he thinks, may have been "good men," but he scouts the idea of their inspiration—and holds it unreasonable to suppose "a supernatural influence to cause the record of that which can only issue in a puzzle." He admits, however, that

"The application of ideology to the interpretation of Scripture, to the doctrines of Christianity, to the formularies of the Church, may, undoubtedly, be carried to an excess—may be pushed so far as to leave in the sacred records no historical residue whatever.—An example of the critical ideology carried to excess, is that of Strauss, which resolves into an ideal the whole of the historical and doctrinal person of Jesus.—But it by no means follows—that there are not traits in the Scriptural person of Jesus, which are better explained by referring them to an *ideal* than an historical origin; without falling into *fanciful* exegetics, there are parts of Scripture more usefully interpreted ideologically than in any other manner; as, for instance, the history of the temptation of Jesus by Satan, and accounts of demoniacal possessions. *And liberty must be left to all as to the extent in which they apply the principle; for there is no authority, through the expressed determination of the Church, nor of any other kind, which can define the limits within which it may be reasonably exercised.* Thus some may consider the descent of all mankind from Adam and Eve as an undoubted historical fact; others may rather perceive in

that relation a form of narrative, into which, in early ages, tradition would easily throw itself spontaneously.—And many narratives of Miracles and catastrophes in the Old Testament are referred to in the New as *emblems*, without either denying or asserting their truth: such as the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah by fire from heaven, and the Noachian Deluge.”—pp. 225 and 226.

He proceeds, on the next page, to apply the same “exegetical ideology” to Christianity, whose origin, to a great extent, he asserts, “rests, ultimately, on *probable* evidence.” He recommends this principle, as a relief “from many difficulties which might otherwise be very disturbing,” as doubtless they are to those pious divines, who retain office in a Church which requires them weekly to preach doctrines which they consider superstitious, and subscribe to Articles which they don’t believe, simply because they are sworn and paid to do so. Before the ideologist, all difficulties vanish—“discrepancies in narratives, scientific difficulties, defects in evidence, do not disturb him as they do the *literalist*.” The Miracles, Divine nature, Priesthood and Incarnation of Christ, are all settled, to the full satisfaction of the “free-handling” board of Essayists. Listen to our ingenious author :

“The spiritual significance is the same of the transfiguration, of opening blind eyes, of causing the tongue of the stammerer to speak plainly, of feeding multitudes with bread in the wilderness, of cleansing leprosy; whatever links may be deficient in the traditional record of particular events. Or, let us suppose one to be uncertain whether our Lord were born of the house or lineage of David, or of the tribe of Levi, and even to be driven to conclude that the genealogies of Him have little historic value; nevertheless, in *idea*, Jesus is both Son of David and Son of Aaron; both Prince of Peace and High Priest of our profession, as He is under another idea, though not literally—“without father and without mother.”—In like manner, it need not trouble us, if, in consistency, we should have to suppose an *ideal origin*, and to apply an ideal meaning to the birth in the city of David, and to other circumstances of the infancy.”—p. 228.

He concludes this long paragraph with a remark which, for its seemingly refreshing naiveté and delightful simplicity, (so congenial to the ingenuous mind of our author,) might well excite the envy of a Machiavelli. It is this :

“The ideologist may *sometimes* be thought *sceptical*.”

It is certain that none of his readers will doubt the possibility of such a contingency.

Almost every page of his Essay reveals some perfidious stab

against the Church, or the Bible, couched, frequently, in the usual terms of Evangelical orthodoxy, but always admitting of a Rationalistic sense. There is not a doctrine of the Bible, from the fall of Adam to the restoration through Christ and promise of immortality; nor a single article of the Creed, from the "Father Almighty," to "the life everlasting," which is not directly or indirectly impugned by this ordained Minister of Christ.

An unsophisticated layman might suppose, that this writer, having solemnly subscribed to the Articles of the English Church, common honesty would preclude him from even entertaining opinions hostile to her doctrine, so long as he remained her sworn and paid officer. Far from it. The Vicar of Great Staughton is a man of no *common* honesty. He frankly avows and glories in the impunity with which he can *privately* entertain just what opinions *he chooses*,—which is the original and proper signification of the term *heresy*. He complains that Subscription does seem to impose on the conscience some restriction in regard to the free expression of such heresy; but he considers the check "inoperative," provided he can escape the *legal* consequences; for, according to his ethics, "the strictly legal obligation is the measure of the moral one."—pp. 202 and 203. It is to be hoped, that such are not the ethics of the people, whose souls are committed to his care.

This school of "liberal theology," which rejects the childish superstition of an "outer law," contained in the Bible, and leaves every man at liberty to manufacture, from his own brains, rules of conscience to suit himself, might reasonably be expected to furnish some curious developments, in cases where pecuniary interests are at stake. Accordingly, we find our Essayist disclosing a plan, which, by the aid of "modern refinements," and a little ingenuity, will enable any free handling "negative theologian," to hold, conscientiously, his office in the Church of England, together with its emoluments, notwithstanding his subscription to the Thirty-Nine Articles.—He proposes to evade some of them, as follows:

"Forms of expression (such as he specifies) may be adopted with respect to the doctrines enumerated in the five *first* Articles, without directly contradicting,

impugning, or refusing assent to them, *but passing by the side of them*,—as with respect to the humanifying of the Divine Word, and to the Divine Personalities.”—p. 208.

The morality of the above sentence is worse than its grammar.

But this will only answer for the first five Articles ; the sixth, which he calls a “Pivot Article,” cannot be thus evaded, inasmuch as it is very explicit in regard to the sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures. To this one he applies his favorite principle of “exegetical ideology.”

Hear his interpretation of what he calls the “Pivot Article.”

“Under the terms of the sixth Article, one may accept, literally or allegorically, or as parable or poetry or legend, the story of a serpent tempter, of an ass speaking with man's voice, of an arresting of the earth's motion, of a reversal of its motion, of waters standing in a solid heap, of witches, and a variety of apparitions. So, under the terms of the sixth Article, every one is free in judgment as to the primeval institution of the Sabbath, the universality of the Deluge, the confusion of tongues, the corporeal taking up of Elijah into heaven, the nature of Angels, the reality of demoniacal possession, the personality of Satan, and the miraculous particulars of many events.”—p. 198.

This ideological plea is met by a *replication* from the Canon law, which declares these Articles “agreeable to the word of God,” and requires of the Minister that subscribes them, “that he alloweth,” and “that he acknowledgeth the same to be agreeable to the word of God.” To this he *rejoins* by a quibbling verbal equivocation upon the words “allow,” and “acknowledge,” which would disgrace a school-boy in a debating exercise, and which, in view of the moral dishonesty of the claim it supports, is shocking in a Clergyman.

Here, again, he is still opposed by a *sur-rejoinder*, in the shape of a statute of the realm, which, under penalties, enforces the Canon law. This he *rebutts*, on the ground, that said statute is three hundred years old, although pronounced “*in viridi observantia*,” and that the meshes are too open for modern refinements.”—p. 208.

A more pitiful instance of *special pleading* in a dishonest cause we have never met with, than is set forth by this writer, on pages 202 to 213 of his Essay.—He expressly avows, that his “strictly legal responsibility is the measure of the moral one;” and while he consoles himself that, “as far as opinion privately

entertained is concerned, (his) liberty appears already to be complete;" in regard to heretical views, he still complains, that "there may be some interference with the expression of them." He comes, however, to the conclusion, by special pleading, that he may safely enunciate them. Therefore, in violation of his Subscription, in violation of his Ordination vow, and also in violation of common honesty, he feels himself at liberty to promulgate views subversive of the Church which has employed him as a fiduciary agent, and pays him to uphold her doctrines. If any layman should undertake to do business upon the same principles which this Clergyman avows and defends, he would not be deemed worthy of belief under oath, and he would fail to obtain credit with his grocer or tailor.

We have thus attempted to show, in their native deformity, the real views of this Essayist, by using his words, apart from the Jesuitry which invests them with an apparently orthodox expression, and places them in a deceptive connection.

After a very careful examination of his Essay, we come to the conclusion that, if ever there was a Jesuit outside the society of Loyola, that man is the Rev. Henry Bristow Wilson, Vicar of Great Staughton. While he is behind none of his associates in a negation of Divine truth, he surpasses them all in special pleading and moral dishonesty. We are not surprised to find a man of such mental and moral constitution inclined to take refuge in *individual annihilation*, implied by the doubting hope, with which he closes his Essay, of a final absorption or "refuge in the bosom of the Universal Parent."

Essay No. 5 is on the Mosaic Cosmogony. By C. W. Goodwin, M. A.

In this liberal school of "negative Theologians," Mr. Goodwin is the only layman, and the most honest member of the fraternity, but not the most learned. It redounds greatly to the credit of his integrity, that he *refused* to take Orders in a Church, the doctrines of which he could not uphold.

His Essay is confined to a single point of Divine Revelation, but that is a most important and comprehensive one—to wit: the character and inspiration of the Mosaic Cosmogony.

After the first perusal of the volume before us, we selected



this gentleman as one with whom to break a lance in defence of the Bible, not only because he is the only layman, but because the subject he has chosen is one on which we profess to have some practical knowledge. Before entering the lists with our chosen adversary, we proposed, at the outset, to give to the Knights of Theology but a passing salute—mindful of our early classical instruction, that “footmen should not contend among horsemen.” It seems, however, that, forgetful of this precept, we have been involuntarily betrayed into so extended a notice of the other Essays, that the prescribed limits of this Review will not permit the execution of our first intention. We therefore now propose to give to this Essay the same cursory critical examination as to the others, and reserve a full and scientific answer for another opportunity.

Mr. Goodwin attacks the inspiration and validity of the Bible as a Divine revelation, by directing all his force against its Cosmogony, in order to prove that it is to be considered “as the speculation of some Hebrew Descartes or Newton, promulgated in all good faith, (by the Mosaic writers,) as the best and most probable account that could be then given of God’s universe.”—p. 277—but that, as “a plain statement of facts,” which it pretends to be, “it manifestly gives a view of the universe adverse to that of modern Science,” and manifestly at “variance with facts,” and that it is the production of two different writers.

This short statement covers the entire ground of his subject and the whole scope of his undertaking, except some general astronomical and geological prolegomena, and some animadversions on the current popular and theological views of Bible doctrine,—of which the following extract is a sample :

“Theology, the science whose object is the dealing of God with man as a moral being, maintains but a shivering existence, shouldered and jostled by the sturdy growths of modern thought, and bemoaning itself for the hostility it encounters.”  
p. 238.

Our author treats his subject in a two-fold manner. First, and principally, by a minute verbal criticism of the language of Moses—and secondly, by showing that “some of the popular conciliation theories” are contradictory to each other, or inconsistent with the facts.

We propose to notice, in the first instance, this last head ; for, although our author devotes more pages to its consideration than to the other, it has really but little to do with the conclusion he seeks to arrive at. It is little material to the point at issue, that different writers, geological or theological, have, from different stand-points, interpreted the language of Moses in different ways—and that the untenable positions of Buckland are contradicted by the equally untenable views of Archdeacon Pratt. The position which he is bound to establish is, that the revelations of Geology prove the Mosaic account to be a false description of what it pretends to represent as truth, is utterly at variance with facts, and therefore has no claims to be considered a Divine revelation. We agree with him, “that it could not have been the object of a Divine revelation to instruct mankind in physical science ;” but we deny his assertion, that any attempt is made at *scientific exactness*. The point at issue is, whether the account, such as it is, was a Divine revelation, or whether, as he asserts, it was the shrewd speculation of some Hebrew Descartes. As he appeals to Geology in proof of his position, he is bound to abide by this appeal, and to substantiate his charge against Moses, from his own knowledge of the true facts of the Science, and not by invoking the errors and discrepancies of other writers, who have interpreted both Moses and Geology to suit their own peculiar views, theological or scientific. He finds no difficulty in placing Buckland, Pratt, and Hugh Miller in “trenchant” opposition—but he breaks down in his attack upon the latter. He affects not to see, or else to disparage, the accordance which Miller establishes between the order of creation as revealed to Moses, and the facts which Geology discloses—because, from its generality, some scientific details are omitted. He lapses, grievously, in respect to candor as well as logic, in the argument which he opposes to this accordance. Miller, in speaking of the prominence which is given to the moon among the heavenly bodies by the sacred penman—uses this expression : “It is the apparent, then, not the actual, which we find in the passage ; what *seemed* to be, not what *was*.” He elsewhere tells us, that in whatever way the revelation was communi-

cated to Moses—whether by *words, ideas, or vision*, reason required that he should clothe it “in language fitted to the ideas of his time,” which would be understood by the people, without shocking “the apparent evidences of the senses.” This is a very sensible remark of Miller’s; for, had the apparent fact, so obvious to their senses, been scientifically stated, (as our present author requires,) the sceptics of those days would have rejected the *truth*, upon the self-same principle which these Essayists adopt—to wit: that it was contrary to their experience and to their reason. It likewise accords with what we maintain is the true design and object of the revelation; namely,—that it was not intended to instruct men in Astronomy or Geology, but to teach them that *God brought into existence the visible universe by successive acts of creative energy.*

But, to return to our point. Miller, in a separate chapter, unfolds at length, and with apparent approbation, the views of Kurtz and others, in regard to the precise *mode* or form in which this revelation was conveyed to Moses. These writers agree in the theory, that the *past* history of the world was made known to the Prophet, by a series of optical visions, just as *future* events were, by similar means, revealed to other Prophets. Such speculations, we would remark, may be well enough for those who are curious to find out the *precise* modes which God has adopted in making His revelations to men, but they are entirely irrelevant as to the *facts* revealed.

Now let us see what use our Essayist makes of the above quotation. He seizes upon its isolated wording, and placing it in connection with the theory of Kurtz, (contained in a subsequent chapter,) in regard to the *mode* of the revelation, which theory he jeeringly styles, “the vision hypothesis” of Miller,—and from these premises he constructs an argument to overthrow Miller’s doctrine, that the facts of Geology are in accordance with, not in hostility to, the *facts* revealed in the Mosaic account. His argument is thus expressed:

“The theory founded upon this hint is, that the Hebrew writer did not state facts, but merely certain appearances, and those, not of things which really happened,—but of certain occurrences which were presented to him in a vision, and that this vision greatly deceived him as to what he seemed to see; and thus, in effect, *the real discrepancy of the narrative with facts is admitted.*”

In courtesy we have styled this an argument, because the author intended it as such ; but it would puzzle a logician to say what kind of an argument it should be called. It does not rise to the merit of a *petitio principii*, for that supposes the disputants to be discussing the same subject, the one begging the question of the other ; but our Essayist does not beg the question, viz : the truth of the facts, but he substitutes an entirely new one, *the mode of revelation* ; and even in that there is no logical sequence between premises and conclusion. Miller says there is no discrepancy between the *facts* of Geology and the facts of Revelation. Kurtz says, that the *mode* in which these facts were revealed to the Prophet, was by the appearance of visual occurrences, representing the facts. Our Master of Arts reasons, that since, according to this theory in regard to the mode of revelation, certain appearances of certain occurrences were presented to the Prophet in a vision,—therefore it is asserted that the Hebrew writer did not state facts—and thus the real discrepancy of the narrative with the facts, is admitted ! He might with just as much logical truth and sequence have said, since it is asserted that the picture of the Duke of Wellington is not a real person, therefore the battle of Waterloo never took place ! The *mode* in which certain facts are revealed is altogether a different question from the *truth* of these facts.

But verbal criticism is our Essayist's strong weapon, not logic nor Geology. In the preceding Essay, we have seen Mr. Wilson demolishing the whole of the Bible by ideology—utterly discarding “literalism.” In this Essay, Mr. Goodwin heartily embraces literalism, and proposes to demolish Moses by Philology. It would seem as if the Board of Essayists thought that Mr. Wilson had carried his ideal interpretation rather too far, and therefore determined he should be succeeded by Mr. Goodwin, who is a *literalist* with a vengeance. Not only does he hold Moses, Job, Samuel and David, writing in the poetic form of their Oriental tongue, strictly *au pied de la lettre*, but he claims for this letter all the rigid precision which can be strained out of etymology, although it is easy to show that the prose of his own frigid language cannot abide

such treatment. Take, for instance, the following specimen, on page 247, in regard to the word *רָקִיעַ*, *rakia*—the plain, obvious meaning of which is “expanse.” “The work of the second day of creation is, to erect the *vault* of heaven, (Heb., *rakia* ; Gr., *στερεωμα*; Lat., *firmamentum*,) which is represented as supporting an ocean of water above it.” And he coolly proceeds to inform us, that the intended meaning of this term is, “solid vault.” It is plain to see from his above reference to the Septuagint and Vulgate, that he got his own idea of this Hebrew word, not from the original, but from its Greek and Latin perversions. Thus, from the former, he gets his idea of “solid ;” and his “vault” he obtains from “*cælum*,” of the latter—which is derived from *κοιλον*, “a cavity or hollow,” and, uniting both with “*firmamentum*,” he asserts that the Hebrew idea of the sky or heaven is that of a “permanent solid vault,” or cavity ! This, he says, “is evident enough from various expressions made use of concerning it ;” in proof of which he cites the following four instances, viz : the author of the poem of Job says—“the pillars of heaven tremble.” David, in his song, 2 Sam. xxii. 8, says, “the foundations of heaven moved ;” the author of Psalm 78, says, “and opened the doors of heaven,” and Moses himself says, “and the windows of heaven were opened.” Therefore it is evident he meant a permanent solid vault, since “*it is said to have pillars, foundations, doors and windows.*” He immediately adds—“No quibbling about the derivation of the word *rakia*, which is, literally, something beaten out, can affect the explicit description of the Mosaic writer, contained in the words, “the waters that are above the firmament,” or avail to show, that he was aware that “the sky is but transparent space.”—p. 247. In the foot-note to this passage he says, “The root (of *rakia*) is generally applied to express the hammering or beating out of metal plates ; hence, something beaten or spread out.” Taking this, in connection with the rest of the paragraph, it is fully evident that our author considers that Moses taught these ignorant and poetic Hebrews, that “the sky, firmament or heaven,” was a great metallic pan, “supporting an ocean of water above it.”

Such is the absurd interpretation of the seventh verse of the first chapter of Genesis, which *philology* enables our literalist to arrive at, from the etymology of a single word, which the poet translates literally,

"And God made  
The firmament expanse of liquid pure,  
Transparent, elemental air diffused."

This verse, translated word for word, reads thus: "And made God the expanse, and divided between the waters which (are) from beneath to the expanse, and between the waters which (are) from above to the expanse. And it was so;" which says, as plainly as the Hebrew tongue is capable of saying, that the second act of creative power produced the atmospheric expanse, which held the waters in the clouds above separate from the waters on the earth beneath.

Now let us apply this philological test to our author's own language. In speaking of the canopy of heaven, he uses, on page 239, the term, "ethereal vault." This is precisely the same word which he erroneously puts into the mouth of Moses, to express the same idea. "Ah," says he, "I don't make it 'solid,' I qualify it by *ethereal*." No quibbling, Mr. Goodwin, about the word ethereal; its root, *albu* means, "to shine," and it is fully as absurd to represent the sky as a *vault*, made of moonshine or sunshine, as it is to make it of metal or any other solid substance, "hammered or beaten out."

Let us try him again. He says the sun, though in reality motionless, yet appears to our senses as "traversing the *skyey bridge*;" and further down he speaks of the milky way as "the *glittering dust* which emblazons the nocturnal sky."—But we suppose our author to interrupt, by saying, "Oh! it is easy for any one to see, that these terms are necessarily figurative, and that I employ them for want of better, to express my ideas." Necessarily figurative are they? Why did he not think of that when he was "hammering" out of *rakia* a solid *skyey* vault for Moses, who, in his vision, never "dreamed" of such an idea, when he used the term "expanse." Besides, the Hebrew was eminently a figurative language, and such was its poverty, that the same word is frequently used, figuratively to

express many different ideas. In addition to this, the people to whom Moses spoke were by nature inclined to the figurative and poetical; as one of these Essayists remarks in regard to Oriental modes of speech, "expressions, which would be regarded as rhetorical exaggerations in the Western world, are the natural vehicles of thought to the Eastern people." Even our own English, so rich and copious, abounds in every day expressions of figurative derivation, widely different from their original signification. We say of a man's house, or of his fortune, that it is *dilapidated*; and from this expression, such a literalist as Mr. Goodwin would prove, by philology, that his house must have been built of stone, and his fortune consisted of gems and jewels. We repeat what we have before said in this review, that critical philology, in skillful hands, applied to a living tongue, is the most unreliable of all tests—and it is sheer absurdity to rely solely upon it in the case of a dead language, with a view to establish any fact, or to determine any nice question of meaning.

Words, when used with the greatest care, are deceptive vehicles of thought, especially when interpreted by the special pleading of a critical philology. It is seldom that we see two men, of ordinary capacity and education, arguing together for half an hour in their own mother tongue, without being aware that the greater part of their dispute is a *logomachy*, proceeding from the want of a proper definition and common understanding of the words they use. A philological knowledge of the derivation, affinities, proper meaning, right use, and true power of words, is a most valuable one, and seldom possessed, to any great extent, by those who write, or by those who speak. But the critical application of arbitrary rules, to ascertain nice shades of meaning, and possible significations of isolated words in a dead language, is a very unreliable method of determining the *intended* meaning of the words, the doctrine of the writer, or the genuineness of the book. For it supposes two contingencies, not very likely to exist: first, that the critic has a better knowledge of a dead tongue, and its local use of terms, than most men would claim for their own language; and, secondly, that the author himself was aware of all the nice etymo-



logical distinctions of his language, and the possible exceptions to it, which some caviling philologist might take three thousand years afterwards. A practical acknowledgment of the truth of our position is contained in the common saying, that no man can write his own Will so clearly, that a sharp lawyer cannot find in its language some flaw, subversive of its intended meaning.

But, Mr. Goodwin's strong hold of scepticism is the *literal* acceptation of the word "*day*." This alone is sufficient to prove the Mosaic Cosmogony, which he rejects, utterly at variance with that of Geology, which he believes. He thinks it absurd to believe, that the word so plainly written "*day*," can possibly mean anything else, in this connection, but a period of twenty-four hours, determined, as he informs us, in his astronomical and geological prolegomena, by the diurnal revolution of 'the earth about its own axis.' Moreover, he cites Archdeacon Pratt, who is a believer in the Mosaic Cosmogony, as proving that the word *must* mean an ordinary day; since, otherwise, it would not support his own interpretation of the wording of the Decalogue.

We would remind Mr. Goodwin, that the word "*day*," in our own copious language, has a very general meaning—and that, in common parlance, it is used to express the duration of a man's life,—an age or century,—or any indefinite period of time. But in Hebrew, the word "*yōm*," had, necessarily, from the poverty of the language, a more general acceptation. In Psalm xcv., 8, it means forty years. In Numbers, Ezekiel, and Daniel, it is put, synonymously, for *years*, and in some twenty places which we have examined, from Genesis to Hosea, it is used to express the idea of an indefinite or undetermined period of time, necessarily so from the poverty of the language, and not as an optional figurative term. Besides, Moses, in recapitulating the successive acts by which the heavens and the earth were finished, and all the host of them, says: "*These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the Lord God made the earth and the heavens.*" But there are two reasons, which prove,

conclusively, that Moses did not use this word in the precise and restricted sense which Mr. Goodwin asserts.

1st.—He applies the word “day,” to express the principle of *light*; for, while as yet the universe was without laws or shape, and the earth was without form and void, “God called the light Day.”

2dly.—The length of our days, as well as that of other planets of our solar system, depends upon the present relation of these bodies to the sun. Thus, the moon’s days are twenty-seven times as long as our globe’s, and other bodies in our system have days of seventy and one hundred times greater length. Now, three of the days specified by Moses were before that relation was established between sun, moon, stars, and our globe, which God produced on the fourth day—in order that these heavenly bodies might serve man, “for signs and for seasons, and for days and for years.” It is, therefore, perfectly evident, that these three days could not have been such as are now determined by the diurnal revolution of this earth about its own axis. But our author thinks, that the use of the terms, “evening and morning,” must necessarily imply, that the period of time designated was intended to be an ordinary day. Do the terms, morning and evening of life, necessarily imply an existence of a day? The terms *eve* and *dawn*, as applied to indefinite periods of time, are of every day occurrence in our own language. For thirty years, we have been on the *eve* of a great struggle, which has ushered in a *night* of political disaster, but we look for the *dawn* of a better *day*, which shall be perpetual. We maintain, that the poverty of the Hebrew compelled Moses, in his day, to the use of the word “day,” as he could find no better one, to express the succession of periods of time, of fixed, but unknown duration, and its use rendered the terms evening and morning, in a figurative sense, the most natural and proper words to designate its beginning and close.\* There seems, also, to be a peculiar ap-

\* The only words that seem to militate against this opinion are, דֹר (dōr.) Eccl. i. 4. “One generation goeth,” &c. Ps. lxxii. 5. “Throughout all generations.” Gen. vi. 9. “Noah was perfect in his generations.”

דָּר (eth.) Dan. xi. 24; “even for a time,” which word is also used by Daniel to

propriateness in the use of these words figuratively, to designate the *gradual* beginning and ending of those great changes in the condition of our globe, which Geology claims were accomplished by slow developments. We would now remark, in flat contradiction to Mr. Goodwin, that the apparent subordination of sun, moon and stars "to give light upon the earth," and the comparative insignificance, in the scale of creation, of this latter body, "man's obscure home," on which he lays great stress, does in no manner contradict, (as he asserts,) the laws of Astronomy, nor has it any direct relation to them.

Had Moses been as well acquainted with Astronomy as Kepler or Newton, he would have, most reasonably, used the precise words of the text. For the Prophet was not revealing to men laws of science, but he was revealing to a simple people the *Author* and the *Order of Creation*, in their own simple and figurative language. His inspiration was not given him to proclaim those scientific laws which govern the relations of matter, and for the study of which man has faculties given him, but he stood, as the Prophet of God, to reveal the relation which the universe of matter bore to that immortal being, who is the Creator's crowning master-piece. In this connection, his mention of the sun, moon and stars to give light to man, on this insignificant globe, (as to size,) was most truthful. For the whole of our solar system of *dead* matter is a less monument of the power and skill of the Creator, than a *living* gnat, and the entire universe of unorganized worlds has not a feather's weight in importance, compared to the soul of a Hottentot. With the great Creator, to use the expressive and true words of Coleridge, "dirt is cheap."

"Consider first, that great  
Or bright infers not excellence; the earth,  
Though in comparison of heaven so small  
Nor glistening, may of solid good contain  
More plenty, than the sun that barren shines."

---

mean a year. מוֹעֵד (mo'edh.) Gen. i. 14; "and let them be for signs of *seasons*." עֹלָם (olam), signifying, properly, a tract of time, whose beginning and ending are both out of view. The sense of "Eternity" is generally given to it; some times it is used in the sense of the Gr. *aiwv*.

The above is given on the authority of Thos. F. Davies, Prof. of Hebrew, Berkeley Div. School.

We will not pause to point out all the blunders of our author, logical, philological, and geological ; but we will notice two misrepresentations which indicate the *animus* of the writer. On page 265 he asserts, that "the creation of birds is attributed to the fifth day,—that of reptiles to the sixth." The sacred text makes the *fifth day the peculiar age of creeping reptile monsters*. Again, on page 248 he says, "On the *fifth* day the waters are called into productive activity, and bring forth fishes and marine animals, *as also the birds of the air*;" and in a foot note he adds : "In the second narrative of creation in which no distinction of days is made, the birds are said to have been formed out of the *ground*." Now, what does the original say in regard to the fifth day ? "And God said, let the waters teem with *creeping* things, living creatures, and let the fowl fly over the earth in the expanse of heaven." But, Mr. Goodwin will reply, that the text of the English version *seems* to imply, that the waters produced the birds. Granted ; what then ? Does Mr. Goodwin mean to apply his critical, philological literalism to an ambiguous expression of king James' translators, or to the words of Moses ? Is such a blunder caused by ignorance, or is it malice ? We charitably conclude it is caused by the former, since we have just seen him interpreting *RAKIA* from the Septuagint and Vulgate. We doubt, however, whether Mr. Goodwin will thank us for our charity, for we believe that these Essayists, who advocate so strongly the supremacy of Reason, would rather be accused of malice, than of ignorance.

We propose, presently, to examine this Mosaic record, which is so repugnant to Mr. Goodwin's "modern knowledge," for the purpose of ascertaining whether "it gives a view of the Universe, adverse to modern science," and manifestly at variance with truth, as he asserts. To avoid all quibbling, we will give a literal, word for word, translation of the original text, taken from Bagster's Manual, which, we trust, Mr. Goodwin's modern scholarship will not object to, and, side by side, we will give our paraphrase, with such geological comments as may occur. It is true, that geological divisions are, to a certain extent, arbitrary ; but we will adopt those indicated by our

author, supplying the divisions omitted, and some of the groups.

The four great divisions of Rocks are : 1st, Azoic ; 2d, Palæozoic ; 3d, Secondary ; and 4th, Tertiary.

The Azoic formation is generally supposed, as the name indicates, to contain no organic remains, and that its unstratified and metamorphic rocks represent sedimentary deposits, changed by heat, and overlaying an interior of melted lava. Our author adopts the common hypothesis, that the first state of our earth was that of a melted globule, "fluid with intense heat, and spinning on its own axis." The Palæozoic rocks contain the first forms of *ancient life*, vegetable and animal, deposited in the depths of that primitive ocean formed on the third day, when the waters were gathered together, and the dry land appeared. The three divisions of this formation are, Lower Silurian, Upper Silurian, and Devonian.

The Secondary rocks consist of four most important and significant divisions. The lowest is the Carboniferous—the immense cemetery of a pristine, gigantic vegetation. Next comes the New Red Sandstone, which contains but two groups, the Permian and Triassic. Above this lies the Oolite, whose groups are replete with fishes, *egg-bearing* reptiles, birds, and amphibious monsters ; and, lastly, come the groups of the Cretaceous division, which exist in Europe, but are wanting in this country.

The New Red Sandstone division, which Mr. Goodwin entirely ignores, is a most important *mediator* between Moses and Geology. It lies immediately over the Carboniferous division, the great theater of that gigantic vegetation, which, according to Moses, distinguished the third day or age of the world, and also immediately under the Oolite, which embalms those amphibious reptiles, which he describes as the distinguishing feature of the fifth day. This division, therefore, corresponds to the *fourth* day of the Mosaic record ; and what does that record say ? It says, that on that day our present Solar system was arranged, and, consequently, that new modifications of the previous laws of light, heat, and moisture, and a new order of Nature, corresponding to the present, were then introduced.

But what does Geology say? It says, that in the intervening New Red Sandstone, the ancient forms of *Palæozoic life became extinct, and a new order introduced.*

The Tertiary formation constitutes the last and uppermost crust of the earth, and may be divided into Tertiary rocks proper, and modern diluvial formations, and superficial alluvial accumulations.

The proper Tertiary rocks contain four groups, viz: the Eocene, (lowest,) whose fossils are only 3½ per cent. of living species; the Miocene, containing 17 per cent.; the Pleiocene, 41 per cent.; and the Pleistocene (*most recent*) group, whose fossils are 95 per cent. of recent species. The fossils of *man* are found only in the dust from which he was created, and which covers the surface of the last modern formation.

Let us now see what the original record says, and what it means.

## LITERAL TRANSLATION.

## DAY FIRST.

*Genesis, i. chap. 1st verse.*

In (the) beginning created God the heaven and the earth.

## 2nd verse.

And the earth was wateness and voidness, and darkness (was) upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God (was) hovering upon the face of the waters.

## 3d verse.

And said God, Let there be light, and there was light.

## PARAPHRASE.

## FIRST PERIOD.

*1st verse.*

In beginning the work of creating the universe, God "bara," created the heaven (syn) "air," "expanse," "ether," i. e. *space*, and the substance of the earth, i. e. *matter*.

## 2nd verse.

And matter was without form and void, and darkness was upon the abyss of the fluid elementary matter; and the Spirit of God moved upon the waters.

Note Mr. Goodwin's interpretation of this verse:—"The earth is supposed to be submerged under the waters of the deep, over which the Spirit of God—the *air* or *wind*—flutters, while all is involved in darkness."

## 3d verse.

This sublime verse cannot be paraphrased. We would simply remark, that Light—that mysterious, subtle fluid, allied to, if not identical in essence with, electricity and magnetism—is the *soul* of matter, as life is the soul of organization, and the *Spirit* of God the soul of man.

Mr. Goodwin coolly remarks, with an ignorance of science truly astonishing, that light existing before the sun is "repugnant to our modern knowledge." Is he so ignorant as to suppose that our sun is the only source and storehouse of light, and that it does not pervade all matter?

## 4th and 5th verses.

And saw God the light that (it was) good; and separated God between the light and between the darkness.

And called God to the light, Day; and to the darkness called he Night; and there was evening and there was morning, the day one.

## DAY SECOND.

## 6th, 7th and 8th verses.

And said God, Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it be dividing between waters to waters.

And made God the ("*rakia*") expanse and divided between the waters above from (are) which waters the between and expanse the to beneath from (are) which to the expanse. And it was so.

And called God to the expanse heaven. And there was evening and there was morning, day second.

## DAY THIRD.

## 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th verses.

And said God, Let there be gathered together the waters from under the heaven unto place one, and shall be seen the dry (land) and it was so.

And called God to the dry (land) earth, and to the gathering of the waters, he called seas; and saw God that (it was) good.

And said God, Let sprout forth the earth, of grass, green herbage seedling seed, tree of fruit making fruit to its kind, which its seed (is) in it upon the earth; and it was so.

And brought forth the earth grass, of green herbage seedling seed to its kind, and tree making fruit which its seed (is) in it, to its kind. And saw God that (it was) good.

And there was evening and there was morning, day third.

## DAY FOURTH.

## 14th to 19th verses.

And said God, Let there be luminaries in the expanse of the heaven to divide be-

## 4th and 5th verses.

And God separated the principle of light from its combination with matter, and he called the visible manifestation of light, Day; and its absence he called Night; and there was a gradual beginning and close to the phenomena presented during this first period of Nature's laws.

*Query.*—How was it possible to extract from this verse the idea of a day of twenty-four hours, determined by the revolution of our globe upon its own axis?

## SECOND PERIOD.

## 6th, 7th and 8th verses.

And God said, Let there be an *atmosphere* to divide the waters.

And God made an atmospheric expanse and divided the waters which are in the sky above, from the waters which are on the earth beneath the sky.

And God called this expanse heaven. And there was a twilight beginning, dawning into brighter day, which marked the commencement and close of this second period of nature's laws.

Note that Mr. Goodwin represents this expanse as a "solid vault (which) is said to have pillars, foundations, doors, and windows."

## THIRD PERIOD.

## 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, and 13th verses.

And God gathered the waters of the earth together unto one place, and caused the dry land to appear.

And God called the dry land earth, and the collection of waters called he seas.

And God caused the earth to bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed, and the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself upon the earth.

Thus, upon the visible dry land, was *vegetable life* gradually brought into existence, from its simplest to its highest types, and the luxuriance of its growth under different conditions of light, heat, and moisture from what now exists, is attested by the carboniferous strata.

It is to be inferred, that while the earth sprouted forth vegetation, the ocean also brought forth its algae, fucoid sea-weeds, stone-lilies and corals; its zoophytic animal plants, shells and mollusca, which are revealed in the silurian beds which once formed its bottom.

## FOURTH PERIOD.

## 14th to 19th verses.

God established the laws which now govern our solar system, and those stars



tween the day and between the night, and they shall be for signs and for set times, and for days and years.

And they shall be for luminaries in the expanse of the heaven, to give light upon the earth; and it was so.

And made God two of the luminaries (the) great: the luminary the great for the ruling of the day, and the luminary the small for the ruling of the night; and (he made) the stars.

And set them God in the expanse of the heaven, to give light upon the earth: and to rule in the day and in the night, and to divide between the light and between the darkness, and saw God that it was good. And there was evening and there was morning, day fourth.

#### DAY FIFTH.

*20th to 23d verses.*

And said God, Let bring forth abundantly the waters creeping things, soul of life; and fowl let fly upon the earth upon the face of the expanse of the heaven.

And (*bara*) created God the sea monsters the great, and every soul of the life which (*is*) creeping which brought forth abundantly the waters to their kind and (created) every fowl of wing to its kind; and saw God that it was good.

And blessed them God, saying, Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and the fowl let multiply in the earth. And there was evening and there was morning, day fifth.

which are the *suns* of other systems. He so regulated their motions that they should produce the diurnal changes of day and night, and the annual revolutions of recurring seasons, and thus be to man for signs of seasons and for days of years. He also so arranged their relative positions, that the sun, moon and stars would all serve to give light to men on this globe.

Before these relative positions were established, the gigantic vegetation of the carboniferous period received its light and heat from other sources.

The terms evening and morning denote the gradual development of this system by the operation of laws which, (for aught the record contains to the contrary,) may have had for their day, millions of years.

Note that these opposite verses are the only foundation which Mr. Goodwin has for his silly misapplication of the trite Galileo story, and the baseless charge that Moses taught the doctrine of the immobility of the earth, adopted by ignorant monks, who knew even less of the Bible than of Astronomy.

#### FIFTH PERIOD.

*20th to 23d verses.*

Prof. T.F. Davies, of the Berkeley Divinity School, has furnished the following as the proper translation of this 20th verse: "And God said, Let the waters teem with creeping things and living creatures, and let the fowl fly over the earth and in the expanse of heaven."

God, during this period, created (*bara*) those creeping monsters of water and land, ichthyosauri, plesiosauri, and cetosauri,—reptile *whales*, lizards and crocodiles, and those gigantic birds—all of which have left numerous fossil memorials of their existence in the formations which immediately overlay the *vegetable* or carboniferous—of the preceding day.

It was eminently an age of *egg-bearing* fishes, reptiles and birds; and Geology attests this fact in the Permian, Triassic and *Oolitic* groups which succeed the carboniferous.

The ascent in the scale of animal life, which these groups present, with the general disappearance of these monsters during the succeeding cretaceous formations, and their extinction at the present day, fully testify that the condition, under which these extinct animals flourished in their day, had its gradual dawn, maturity and close, as the sacred record implies, by the words "evening and morning."

## DAY SIXTH.

24th to 28th and 31st verses.

And said God, Let bring forth the earth, soul of life to its kind, cattle and creeping thing and beast of the earth to its kind; and it was so.

And made God the beast of the earth to its kind, and the cattle to its kind, and every creeping thing of the ground to its kind; and saw God that (it was) good.

And said God, Let us make man in our image, according to our likeness, and let them rule over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the heaven, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over all the creeping thing which is creeping upon the earth.

And created God the man in his image, in the image of God he created (*bara*) him, male and female he created them.

(31st verse.)—And saw God all which he made, and behold (it was) good very;—and there was evening and there was morning, day sixth.

## SIXTH PERIOD.

24th to 28th and 31st verses.

God continued to develop the forms of animal life into those higher types which now exist. In addition to the fish and reptile monsters which characterized the preceding epoch, He now brought into existence reptiles of the land and mammoth cattle of the field;—those dinotheria and megatheria, mastodons, rhinoceri, hippopotami and other mammals, whose remains occur so abundantly in the tertiary deposits which succeeded the cretaceous group.

This tertiary formation shows the beginning of *living* species of animals. Its four groups, beginning at the oldest, present in respective succession, 34, 17, 41 and 95 per cent. of recent species; but no human fossil is found therein. God “formed” man, last of all, from the modern “dust of the ground,” which overlays this tertiary formation, and created (*bara*) in him an immortal soul, which is the true sense of the expression, “image of God,” and which, in no manner, applies to his physical form.

It is worthy of note, that the word בָּרָא *bara*, “created,” occurs but in three connections in this 1st chapter of Genesis: viz. in the first verse, in connection with the creation of matter; then in connection with animal life, on the fifth day; and lastly, in connection with the immortal soul, on the sixth day. In all other places the productive agency of the Creator is expressed by words meaning, to form, shape, mould, or develop.

This account is continued, in the second chapter of Genesis, in these words: “And were completed, the heaven and the earth, and *all their host*. And completed God on the day the seventh, His work which He made; and He rested on the day the seventh from all His work which He had made. And blessed God the day the seventh, and sanctified it; for in it He rested from all His work, which created God to make.

These (are) the generations of the heaven and the earth, in their being created, in the DAY of the making of Jehovah God earth and heaven.”

This language declares to us, as plainly as Hebrew words can, that after man was called into existence, who, as Agassiz justly remarks in his Zoology, “is the end towards which all

the animal creation has tended, from the first appearance of the first Palæozoic fishes," God has created no new principle, nor has He imposed any new laws upon His previous creation, but He has ceased from all further creative agency, hallowing this seventh day, which *has continued to the present time*, and will continue, as we are elsewhere told, till the great Deliverer shall restore, to their pristine glory, the works of the Creator, now marred by the great Adversary. It is this declaration of the Creator, and not our own "experience," which furnishes the only reasonable confidence in the constancy and immobility of the present laws of Nature. To commemorate this still continuing Sabbath *day* of God, the Hebrews hallowed the seventh part of their time, not only in respect to weeks, but months, and years, and seven years, and seven times seven years.

The reader is now prepared to judge what reason Mr. Goodwin has for saying, "that the *prima facie* meaning of Genesis i. is wholly adverse to the present astronomical and geological views of the Universe, is evident enough."

Let us see what is the brief summary of the *facts* which Moses records, and how Mr. Goodwin meets them.

1st.—The visible appearance of light, and its separation from the darkness of matter, on the first day, or period, is stated to be the first occurrence in the order of Nature. Mr. Goodwin says, light, "existing before the manifestation of the sun, is repugnant to our modern knowledge." We presume he uses the word "our," editorially, in reference to his *own* knowledge, and we would therefore refer him to the first intelligent school-boy, for further additions to his stock of information on this head.

2d.—The next fact stated is, the establishment of an atmospheric expanse, to divide the water in the clouds from the water on the earth. We have seen how Mr. Goodwin has hammered out of this "expanse," a "permanent solid vault," to "support an ocean of water above it."

3d.—The third fact is, the appearance of the dry land, and the production, on its surface, of an abundant and varied vegetation. Geology shows proof of this statement, in the Carboniferous beds, which formed the primitive shores of a prim-

itive ocean ; though vegetable fossils are also found in the lower Silurian rocks, which formed the sedimentary bed of this primitive ocean. Moses does not say that this was the first and only existing form of organic life, and that there were no primitive forms of marine animal life in the depths of this ocean. We believe, however, that the priority of vegetable over animal life, may be fairly deduced from the analogy of Nature. The Prophet does not speak of the unseen bottom of the ocean, but of the *dry land* ; and in regard to that, he states a fact which Geology fully proves. Our scientific literalist, however, would fain have him specify, for the benefit of future naturalists, the Trilobites, and Graptolites, Crinoids, and Corals, and other Zoophytes—*animal plants*, and stone-lilies, which characterize the lower Silurian strata,—and to state, that Molluscs occasionally occur, nearly or quite as low as vegetable fossils—and since he has not done so, his account is repugnant to our modern knowledge. He says, “There remains, moreover, the insuperable difficulty of the plants and trees being represented as made on the third day, that is, more than an age before fishes and birds, which is clearly not the case.”—p. 265.

We will meet the caviler on his own ground, though it be an irrelative one. The graphite of the Laurentian rocks of Canada, is said to be of vegetable origin. These rocks belong to the Azoic formation ; now, if Mr. Goodwin carries his fishes lower than this, he will have to put them, according to his own theory, in the *fire*. We advance this simply as a fit answer to an irrelevant cavil ; for, the priority of terrestrial vegetation to marine animal life, is not embraced in Moses' statement.

4th.—The fourth fact stated by Moses is, that between the first vegetation of the earth, on the third day, and the appearance, on the fifth day, of “creeping things,” and monsters of ocean and air, God completed the arrangement of the heavenly bodies, *as we now see them*, establishing our solar system, so as to conduce to the benefit of man. A necessary consequence of this would be, a change in the face of Nature. Geology says, that between the Carboniferous era of gigantic vegetation, and the Oolitic era, which teemed with just such animals

as Moses specified, there intervenes the New Red Sandstone, in which the old forms of Palæozoic life become extinct, and are succeeded by a new order of Nature.

Mr. Goodwin's *astronomical* objection to this statement is, that it teaches the immobility of the earth: the only ground he has for the assertion is, that Romish monks and theologians thought so, and therefore persecuted the scientific Galileo. But there is not one word in the statement, which contradicts the idea, that the earth was "spinning on its own axis, and revolving round the sun," as fast as the scientific Mr. Goodwin would like to have it.

5th.—We come now to that portion of the Sacred Record which refers to the state of our earth under laws of Nature analogous to, if not identical with, those now existing. *Here all geological speculations in regard to the earth and to the Cosmogony of Moses should, properly, begin.* In regard to those laws which were impressed upon matter, and which controlled the operations of Nature, before the establishment of our solar system, we know nothing, and can know nothing, apart from what has been revealed; for we have neither experience nor analogy to guide us. *We must believe or be silent.* To reason from causes under existing laws in regard to effects produced by causes under unknown laws, is sheer absurdity. Reason may and does find in Geology, and other sciences, attestations to the truth of the facts revealed in the previous part of the record—but all legitimate scientific speculation begins with the *fifth* day.

During this age, we are told, that the waters brought forth *abundantly*, "creeping things," and also, that God created, (*bara*) great sea-monsters, reptiles and birds. This age of egg-bearing animals is fully evidenced and illustrated in the Oolitic groups—as shown in the previous remarks on the fifth period.

While we infer that the ocean, on the third day, brought forth its appropriate vegetation, also its zoophytes, *animal plants*, and other low forms of animal life, seemingly allied to vegetation, so now, after a new order of Nature had been established on the fourth day, the waters are represented as

bringing forth, abundantly, those amphibious "creeping things," which form a connecting link with the land "creeping things," and other beasts of the field, which are to come after them, on the sixth day.

We noticed, on a previous page, an egregious blunder in regard to the birds of this era, into which our *literal* Essayist had fallen, in consequence of applying his critical philology to the English version, instead of to the original text. We will now point out another blunder, from the same cause, equally great, in regard to the "creeping" animals, which form a principal feature of the same age. Not finding this *word* in his English Bible, in the account of the fifth day,—but seeing it plainly printed among the mammals of the sixth day—he says, "according to geological evidence, reptiles would appear to have existed ages before birds and mammals, whereas here, the creation of birds is attributed to the fifth day—that of reptiles to the sixth." He thus proves, that the Mosaic account of the sixth day is not "according to geological evidence," just as cogently as he proved that the account of the fourth day was not in accordance with astronomical science.

6th.—As the physiology of the vertebrated animals shows the extruded *egg* to be the type and simplest form of generation in this class, while the uterus, with the sympathizing mammary glands, is its highest badge—so do we find the oviparous animals, of the fifth period, succeeded by the mammals of the sixth. We have but glanced at the progressive elevation of this class, in our previous remarks, and our limits will not permit us to trace it to its full development in man. Suffice it to say, that God, at the close of the sixth day, *formed* the human animal from the same earth out of which He had made vegetables and brutes—and then, by a third and last act of *creative* energy, He made him an immortal soul, which is man's prerogative. We have already said, that the word *bara*, "created," occurs but in three connections, in this chapter of creation; all the rest of it indicates arrangement and development. Matter, Life, and Soul, is the *triad* of creation, and this triad finds its unity in man, the only *tri-une* creature who thus bears the image of the Creator. The organic life of

his body he holds, as he does its origin, in common with vegetables and brutes in whom Matter and Life are united ; his intellectual being—that mysterious result of Divine organization, which varies with every phase of growth, sickness, and decay—he shares with the higher order of animals ; but his immortal soul allies him to his Maker, and proclaims the TRI-UNE MAN—in whom alone are combined the three *creative* fiat—to be the crowning master-piece of creation.

Let the reader study the beautiful system of progressive creation and gradual development, which this Sacred Record discloses, in perfect agreement with the facts which Science records, and then compare it with the absurd, contradictory theories of spontaneous generation, transmutation and development of species, by which scientific sceptics have sought to escape from the hand of their Creator, in order to find a parentage in molluscs, tadpoles, and monkies, the lineal descendants of microscopic monads, or infusorial points of albumen, vivified by electricity. Such a comparison will force every candid mind to the conclusion, that Rationalism makes far heavier drafts on credulity than Revelation does, and comes to no satisfactory result, after all. For, after man has been traced to the embryotic monad, produced by the generative action of electricity on albumen, or sea-mucus on the shores of the ocean, the difficulty remains as great as at the start. The mind instinctively asks : what generated the electricity and the albumen, and who made the ocean and its shores ? Then, again, granting the first monad to be thus legitimately born—and that by its own self-evolving powers it has, by successive transmutations of species, generated a fish, a bird, or a man, *contrary* to every presumption of experience and analogy—how, we ask, does it happen, that these, its products, continue ever afterwards to produce each its own kind, *in accordance* equally with analogy, experience, and the Mosaic statement ? How much more rational, as well as philosophical, is the revealed doctrine of a Divine creation of each primary organism, endowed with reproductive powers, yielding seed after his kind, whose seed is in itself.

Where did Moses get this Cosmogony and the Decalogue



from, if not from God? Was it from his *ignorant* countrymen, or the more cultivated Egyptians, or did he dream them among the rude shepherds of Midian? We may learn from Diodorus, and from Diogenes Laertius, what were the *Cosmogonies* and worship of the Egyptians—and it is not even supposable, that Moses obtained his moral law from their bestial theology, or that he drew his doctrine of the Divine creation from the generative principle of a male Sun and female Moon. We hold it impossible to account, reasonably, for the origin of so wonderful a *Cosmogony* on any ground short of Divine Revelation; and the same may be said in regard to the Decalogue.

Thus God created matter in the beginning: on the fifth day He created in animals a "*soul of life*;" and, last of all, He created Man, "*a living soul*," and breathed into him immortal life, accompanied with the warning of *death* in case of disobedience.

In this connection let us notice another grievous error of our unlucky philologist. From the words of Gen. i. 29, and Gen. ix. 3, when animal food was added to man's vegetable diet, he *assumes* that Moses taught, that beasts were not subject to death prior to the fall of Adam: for, he says,

"Men and animals were supposed to have been, in their original condition, not carnivorous. It is needless to say, that this has been, for the most part, the construction put upon the words of the Mosaic writer, until a clear perception of the creative design which destined the tiger and lion for flesh-eaters, and, latterly, the geological proof of flesh-eating monsters having existed among the pre-Adamite inhabitants of the globe, rendered it necessary to ignore this meaning."—p. 250.

The unwarrantable assumption, that animals were, originally, exempt from death, till their immortality was lost in that evil hour, when

—"Nature, from her seat,  
Sighing, through all her works gave signs of wo,  
That all was lost,"

we know was adopted by Milton, and exquisitely illustrated in Gessner's beautiful poem,—but no such doctrine is taught by Moses, or any other Bible writer. St. Paul says, in regard to *man*,—"By one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin,"—and "the wages of sin is death;" but we have yet to learn, that it is anywhere asserted in Scripture, that *beasts*

had immortal souls, which could sin by disobeying the Laws of Nature, impressed upon them by their very organization. It might be inferred, that, after the earth was cursed as a punishment to Adam, their ferocity was then turned toward him, and that mutually destructive hostility ensued ; but of this nothing is said. We now, for the present, take leave of Mr. Goodwin, with this word of friendly advice, to eschew, hereafter, critical *philology*, and stick to geometry, of which science, we understand, he is an able Professor.

On the seventh day, we are told, that God rested from all the works that He had made. This Sabbath day of God's rest still continues ; for, since the creation of Adam, He has brought into existence no new principle, but all things continue in the same order as at his fall ; and, we are assured, they will continue to be governed by the same laws until that day when the Lord shall arise terribly to shake the earth, and under a new set of laws will create new heavens and a new earth. On this day, some believe, (and we profess to be of the number,) that fallen man will recover, under the second Adam, that state of physical perfection, which he lost by the first Adam ; and that all who shall be deemed worthy to take part in the first resurrection, whose names are written in the Lamb's book of Life, will, on a restored earth, inhabit a second Paradise. This Sabbath day of God's *elect* will be succeeded by that great and final Day of account, when *all* the dead shall arise, the book of Judgment will be opened, all shall be judged according to their works, sentence pronounced, death destroyed, and Time shall be no more.

These views may properly be called speculations. We deduce them directly from the Word of God, and, let their merit be what it may, they are certainly preferable to, and also more *rational*, than the conclusions which Rationalism arrives at by the scientific aid of "inductive philosophy."

Essay No. 6 is on the Tendencies of Religious Thought in England, 1688 to 1750, by Mark Pattison, B. D.

There is nothing in this Essay to detain us long. It is a well written review of the Theological opinions of the last

century, and of "the Deistical Controversy," with a very evident bias in favor of the Deists.

Among the influences, or "agencies," of that age, which affect the religious thought of the present day, the most powerful, according to him, is,

"The growth and gradual diffusion, through all religious thinking, of the supremacy of reason. This, which is rather a principle, or a mode of thinking, than a doctrine, may be properly enough called 'Rationalism.'"—p. 282.

Mr. Pattison is the apologist of Rationalism, and, as such, his Essay finds its appropriate place in the combined effort of the whole; otherwise it would be out of place,—a disjointed stone in this Temple of Infidelity. His commission is to show, that Rationalism is not such a frightful *word*, as the reader would infer from the preceding five Essays; besides, it is prudent to give him a breathing pause, before he is ushered into the presence of Dr. Jowett, the High Priest of *negative theology*.

As the historian of the theological controversies of the above period, he argues for the supremacy of reason, by showing, that all attempts to make it play a *subordinate* part, were failures. He represents the Church, Scripture, and Reason, as being in continual conflict. The opinion, that Scripture "shone sufficiently by its own light," he pronounces to be,

"The hardy, but *irrational* assertion of Calvin. Every foot of ground that Scripture lost, was gained by one or other of the three substitutes, Church authority, the Spirit, or Reason. Church authority was essayed by the Laudian divines, but was soon found untenable; for, on that footing, it was found impossible to justify the Reformation and the breach with Rome. The Spirit then came into favor with Independency. But it was still more quickly discovered, that on such a basis, only discord and disunion could be reared. There remained, to be tried, Common Reason, carefully distinguished from recondite learning, and not based on metaphysical assumptions. To apply this instrument to the contents of Revelation, was the occupation of the early half of the eighteenth century, with what success has been seen."—p. 360.

He gives us to understand, that this *common reason* did very well at that time, and prepared the way for that uncommon rational illumination, which the present age requires, and which these Essayists are prepared to give.

His history of the religious opinions of the last century is

rather a *projet raisonné*, adverse to Revelation, than an impartial review of the theology of that day.\*

Thus he quotes the words not only of Locke and Coleridge, but of Bishop Gibson, Prideaux, Archbishop Tillotson, Dr. Rogers, Bishop Butler, and the dissenter, James Foster, to show, that these sound and able defenders of that very *supernatural, external, positive Divine Revelation*, which Rationalism rejects,—held, in reality, to “the Rationalism, which is the common character of *all* the writers of this time, and which is a method, rather than a doctrine ;” see pp. 293 to 296.

Now, this use of the *word*, Rationalism, by Mr. Pattison, in the interest of the Essayists, and for the promotion of “the growth and gradual diffusion, through all religious thinking, of the supremacy of Reason,” is the only point we shall make with him, and it will be a short one.

He wishes us to understand, that this word, Rationalism, means a right and proper use of reason to test the truth of theological doctrines, professing to be of Divine Revelation—and, as he remarks, (in reference to the above writers,) “a man’s religious belief is a result which issues at the end of an intellectual process.” To this we cordially assent, and it may add force to these remarks to say, that the writer of these lines was converted from a *rationalistic* scepticism, to a *reasonable* belief in the inspiration and full authenticity and genuineness of the Bible, by just such a “process.” We are not, however, disposed to allow, that such a process is always the case, or is always necessary. But while we admit that this is a correct definition of Rationalism in the abstract, we assert that it in no manner fits that method or “*mode of thinking*,” which characterizes the Rationalism of these Essayists. With them it is not the right use of Reason, which disposes them to investigate, but the *pride* of Reason which pre-disposes them to reject, not only the truths, but the fact of a Divine Revelation. The Rationalism which they adopt, and which they engage Mr. Pattison to defend, is a mixture of the English Infidelity of the past century, with German Mysticism and Neology, with-

\* For the benefit of *future* philologists, as precise as Mr. Goodwin, we would state, that whenever we use the word “*day*,” in this Review, it does not mean twenty-four hours, unless specially indicated.

out the recommendations of either. While it lacks the common sense and bold honesty of Tom Paine, it has the sophistry, without the logical merit, and intellect of Hume. On the other side, while it affects the learned puerilities, it is deficient in the ideality and elaborate, but generally useless erudition, of its German origin.

In a word, *our* definition of this new "mode of thought," which these Essayists claim, and which their American introducer very properly states to be Rationalism, is, simply, that it is a bastard between English Infidelity and German Mysticism, without the merits of either parent. We have nothing further to say in regard to Mr. Pattison, as the only point at issue between us is a philological one—to wit: the definition of the word *Rationalism*.

The 7th Essay is on the Interpretation of Scripture; by Benjamin Jowett, M. A., Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Oxford.

This Essay closes the series of this remarkable book. It endorses, in a very quiet and indirect manner, the teaching of all the other Essays—referring to the peculiar views of each, frequently, in language striking, by its similarity, and making them available for practical use. If there was wanting any additional evidence to prove the complicity of these "*septem contra Christum*," it would be found in the Essay we now propose to consider. Great skill has been displayed in the arrangement of these Essays, and there is a peculiar propriety in the relative position of the first and the last. The opening Essay, on the education of the world, was presented to the reader under the form of an attractive façade to the temple of Infidelity, or, rather, the slaughter-house of Divine truth, proposed to be erected. The concluding Essay, on the interpretation of the Bible, (the only true source of man's moral education,) completes the edifice, by erecting in the rear, a blank dead wall of universal scepticism, without door or loop-hole for escape. They both profess regard for the Scriptures, but the one extracts a vapory spirit from the letter, and the other robs the letter of the true meaning of the spirit.

Dr. Temple, the suggester, strikes the key note, to which

the other Essayists attune their songs, and then opens, with a prelude to the Drama, to which Dr. Jowett, in the after-piece, responds in plaintive strains :

"Arcades ambo,  
Et cantare pares et respondere parati."

Dr. Temple, in the opening Essay, indicates the necessity of getting rid of Divine Revelation, as a bar to the full development of the rational man. The succeeding five Essayists, accordingly, attack, with more or less virulence, special portions of Divine truth. Mr. Jowett, in the closing Essay, gives a method of interpretation, which will enable the *educated* rational man to disbelieve as much of it as he pleases. While he holds the language, and occasionally utters with pathos the sentiment of belief, he instils, at the same time, a latent, deadly scepticism, far more dangerous than the patent Infidelity of the others, which can be easily seen and met.

Professing grief in behalf of religion, on account of erroneous modes of interpretation, he gently gives us the sum of the Rationalistic teaching of his confrères, mournfully informing us, that all other interpretations of the Bible, by those who believe in its Divine inspiration, have, by their contradictions, signally failed to establish any identity of meaning among themselves, in regard to its spiritual doctrine.

The Essay contains little argument, properly so called, and less logic. Its numerous assertions of error, on the part of those who hold to the Creed of the Church, or who believe in the inspiration of the sacred text, are advanced without proof,—many of them being too shallow to admit of any. It abounds in suggestions of doubt, artfully interwoven with the text, upon the principle indicated by Mr. Wilson, and which is so adroitly used by all these Essayists—to wit : "the attention of the hearers was to be *conciliated* by the concrete form of these discourses ;—while, from time to time, as occasion offered, the more peculiar views of the speakers were to be instilled." The author manifests an appreciation of this maxim, when he remarks, "much depends on the manner in which things are said."

Mr. Jowett, in the early part of his Essay, laments, we had almost said *whines*, in such piteous strains, in regard to the

grievous injury done to the cause of *true* religion, by false modes of interpretation, and by bringing to the study of the Bible preconceived opinions, derived from outer influences, instead of honestly endeavoring to find out its plain meaning,—that the reader is tempted to believe, that he has at last got rid of the sophistry, sciolism, and Deistical Rationalism of the preceding writers, and is about to find a different and better *free handling* of the sacred text. But this expectation is sadly disappointed. As he proceeds in his lamentation over the errors of others, there appears, as the result of his own improved method of interpretation, an entire negation of Christian doctrine, surrounded by ambiguous expressions of a different character, well calculated to deceive the reader in regard to the candor and truth of his assertions. In some parts of his Essay, particularly in those pages devoted to the Greek of the New Testament, of which language he is evidently master, Mr. Jowett expresses himself with clearness, reason and force. But his remarks in regard to the theological errors of others, his references to religious truth, and his own method of handling Scripture, are full of ambiguity, doubt and error.

We have hunted his pages for some evidence of a *positive* belief of some sort in regard to Scriptural doctrine, but we have not been able to find any. So far as we can understand an author, who uses the language of Belief and Infidelity in the same breath, he maintains that the Bible contains no spiritual doctrine to be interpreted—or, at least, that no system of doctrine can be logically deduced from it. He asserts, that it is a collection of the disjointed and fragmentary productions of different writers, at different times during the age of the world's childhood and ignorance;—and each production should be judged separately, upon its own merits. We should treat the Bible precisely as we would an edition of Sophocles or Plato, with a view to correct the errors of the authors, as well as of their editors, and to ascertain the literal and “one only true meaning” of each writer. He repudiates the idea, that the Bible should be taken as a connected whole, to establish a system of doctrinal belief; but he says, “nor, indeed, is it easy to say what is the meaning of ‘*proving a doc-*



trine from Scripture ;' for, when we demand *logical* equivalents and similarity of circumstances, when we balance *adverse* statements, St. James and St. Paul, the New Testament with the old,—it will be hard to demonstrate, from Scripture, any complex system, either of *doctrine or practice*—nor can we readily determine, in explaining the words of our Lord or St. Paul, how much (even of the passages quoted) is to be attributed to *Oriental modes* of speech."—p. 404. (The italics are our own.)

Our author tells us, a few pages afterwards, that "the book in which we believe (who does he mean by *we* ?) all religious truth to be contained, is *the most uncertain of all books* ; because interpreted by arbitrary and uncertain methods."

According to Mr. Jowett's *hypothesis*, God exercised no interference in the composition of the book ; and it is not true that holy men of old spake as they were inspired by the Holy Ghost ; but Moses and the Prophets, as well as "St. Paul and the Twelve," spake as well as men could be expected to speak, with their limited opportunities for information, and accordingly made many sad blunders, opposed to modern science and morality. "*There is no ground for assuming design of any other kind in Scripture, than in Plato or Homer.*" Therefore it is the duty of modern criticism to deal with it as it has done with the classics—expurgating its errors, and eliminating the exact literal meaning of the words of each separate writer, for it is a rule of our author, that Scripture should be interpreted *from itself*, apart from any connection with other portions. It hath been said of old that "no prophecy of Scripture is of any private, *i. e.*, *separate* interpretation." But, according to our author, this is not true ; for he holds that all Scripture is of separate interpretation, and verbal criticism is to determine the one meaning of each writer. "Scripture," he tells us, "has (*but*) one meaning,—the meaning it had in the mind of him who first wrote, or those who first received it." It seems to be a fundamental principle in the mind of this Essayist, (derived, doubtless, from habits of expurgatorial criticism, applied to the classics,) that the same words must always, necessarily, convey the same ideas. He lays down the axiom,

"If words have more than one meaning, they may have any meaning."<sup>\*</sup>

In order to ascertain the "one, and one only true meaning" of any Bible writer, he recommends applying to his *words* the test of a close critical examination, of the value of which test his own Essay furnishes a very unfortunate illustration, for it is full of ambiguous expressions admitting of more than one meaning.

In pursuing this method, he proposes two rules. First, to "*interpret the Scripture like any other book.*" The second rule is, "*interpret Scripture from itself,*"—which he explains as meaning, apart from any connection with other portions of a different age or writer,—rejecting the true acceptance of the Canon, "*Non nisi ex Scripturâ Scripturam potes interpretari,*" which he interprets to mean, simply, that we must be familiar with that part of Scripture which we attempt to explain.

According to Mr. Jowett's method, the Bible may be made to prove any doctrine, or none at all. For, by adopting his principle, if we prove that the words of any writer have more than one meaning, they may have any meaning. Now, nothing is more certain than that the same words have, generally, many meanings—that they seldom convey precisely the same ideas to different minds—that the same author uses the same words in different senses—and that few living writers would recognize their own meaning, if their words were critically interpreted by the philological understanding of an adverse party, as our author would admit, if we applied this method, rigorously, to his own language. The true rule in regard to philological evidence is, that it is to be considered as *probable*, *relative*, and *cumulative*, not as certain, positive, or determinate.

If some young and ardent seeker after truth should chance to take up this volume of "*Recent Inquiries,*" and, beguiled by the insinuating sophistry of its first Essay, should make a

---

\* Our author's axiom, "if words have more than one meaning, they may have any meaning," is well illustrated by the following ones; *mea mater est mala sus*, which mean, literally, "run, mother, the sow eats the apples," while another equally literal meaning of the same words is, "my mother is an evil sow."

pilgrimage through its pages, stunned and bewildered by the succeeding Essays, he would naturally seek, in the last one, some refuge from his doubts ; but would only find himself securely immured in the very castle of Doubt, and consigned to the grim custody of giant Despair. One might fancy the Regius Professor of Greek, addressing the unlucky pilgrim in some such strain as this : "I am sorry for you, my young friend, very sorry. But all I can do to help you is, to give you a new method of interpretation. '*Interpret Scripture like any other book.*' First, *assume* that the Word of God has no inspiration, and then treat it just as you would Sophocles or Plato. Find out, *if you can*, its one only true meaning, which, according to my view, no believer in *inspiration* will ever be able to do. This, at least, will relieve you from many doubts in regard to that dangerous party being right. But if this will not satisfy you, I furnish you with an invaluable fundamental principle to apply to the exegesis of the text.—*If words have more than one meaning, they may have any meaning.* By the aid of this, you can believe or disbelieve anything you please. As for myself, I believe in nothing but my Lexicon."

Although this method of interpretation, which Mr. Jowett recommends to others, has not assisted him to any positive belief, it has, nevertheless, enabled him to disbelieve a great many things, and placed him in the front rank of "Negative Theologians." Among the things disbelieved are the following : 1st, Inspiration ; 2d, Miracles ; 3d, Prophecies ; 4th, Original Sin ; 5th, Personality of the Holy Ghost ; 6th, Divinity of our Lord. To which may be added, the Creed, Infant Baptism and Episcopacy, so far as any proof is contained in the Bible.

Now, Mr. Jowett may coo as gently as any turtle dove, and speak lovingly of Christianity, and feelingly of the religion of our Lord, using the term *Saviour*, which none of the others do ;—he may lament, piteously, the errors of others, and regret "the suspicion or difficulty, which attends critical inquiries" of himself and associates after truth, yet, so long as the above charges can be proved against him by his own mouth, and he remains a Presbyterian of the English Church, he is but a wolf in sheep's clothing.

Let us see what Mr. Jowett's method amounts to. It is based entirely on two postulates, which most Christians would consider *self-evident* errors. First, that the Bible is the *same* as any other book ;—secondly, that its words can have only *one* true meaning, and that must be restricted to each isolated writer.

The fallacy which pervades the whole of the Essay is, the *assumption*, that Scripture is in no manner the Inspired Word of God. In order to give any logical consistency to his remarks, he should have first proved this point. If he should say that this preliminary point has been settled by the preceding Essayists, then he acknowledges, in opposition to his caveat, that his Essay is a part of a preconcerted whole. If he deny this fellowship, then he assumes, what the others have undertaken to prove, viz: that the Bible is not a Divine Revelation, and this is the gist of the whole controversy with respect to himself, as well as his associates.

Now, if the Bible be the Word of God, as it professes to be, and as our Saviour, and His Apostles, and the Church, all retrospectively declare it to be—and it must be so considered till the contrary is proved—then is it *not the same* as any other book ; for it contains not only the words of the writers, but the mind of God. It may, therefore, have more than one meaning ;—the meaning in the mind of the writer, designed for his own time, and the meaning in the mind of God, designed for all times.

It is not, like Homer and Plato, Sophocles or Livy, or any classic which has come down to us, *hap-hazard*, from a remote antiquity ; for every *jot* and *tittle* was sedulously guarded by its first custodians, the Jewish Church, while the Christian Church has been equally successful, though less minute in its care.

It is not, like other books, the collection of many writers, as for instance, the *Collectanea Majora*, or this book of Essays, which *claims* to be the disconnected and independent production of many writers, each to be interpreted apart ; but the writers of the Bible, from Genesis to Revelations, are bound together by the authorship and mind of one Spirit, and con

stituted one whole, just as we believe this volume of Essays constitutes one whole, by the consentient authorship of one mind and spirit. Taking no higher ground than that of reason, we much prefer our Saviour's explicit and oft-expressed views in regard to the inspiration and spiritual meaning of the Scriptures, their predictive character and infallibility as the Word of God, to Mr. Jowett's heresy. For the same reason, we prefer the Apostle's rule of interpretation, to our author's irrational method.

If Mr. Jowett thought that our present translation, which he styles "the noblest translation in the world," does not give us, correctly, the words of the different writers, whereby to judge correctly of the mind of the Spirit, he was bound to speak to that point, and to show us the errors. Having settled this matter of words, he might safely have left each one to draw his own spiritual interpretation of them, reserving his own for his Sermons, if he ever writes any. But the treatment of his whole subject is based on the assumption, that there is no Divine inspiration in the Bible, and that all we have to deal with is the separate and disjointed productions of ignorant men, during different ages of the world's history. Such a view might give consistency, and an apparent value to his directions for interpreting their writings, but it does not comport with his language in other respects, which sounds, sometimes, like irony or bombast, if we admit that his hypothesis in regard to these writers is correct. Thus, in the very face of his assumption, which removes entirely the Holy Spirit from the words of the Bible writers, leaving each one to substitute any little human spirit, according to his fancy, he says, grandiloquently, "Scripture is a world by itself, from which we must exclude foreign influences, whether theological or classical. To get inside that world, is an effort of thought and imagination, requiring the sense of a poet as well as a critic,—demanding much more than learning,—a degree of original power and intensity of mind."—p. 423.

Heaven defend us from that *original power and intensity of mind*, which enables our author to consider the Inspired Book as the disjointed production of ignorant men at different

times,—to discover “no design of any other kind in Scripture than in Plato or Homer,”—to ignore the whole system of Bible theology, extending, as it does, with beautiful consistency, from the *sin offering* at Cain’s door, continuously, through the Law and the Prophets, to the Crucified Lamb and the Gospel;—and, finally, to convert the plan of Salvation with the scene on Calvary into an empty farce, by the denial of Original Sin and the Divinity of the Saviour.

To examine critically the six heads into which this Essay is divided, would extend, to an unreasonable length, this review, which has already grown beyond its just limits. We will, therefore, merely give, in addition to a few brief comments, samples of the peculiar views which this writer seeks to instill, in his most conciliatory manner.

“The diffusion of a critical spirit in history and literature, is affecting the criticism of the Bible in our own day, in a manner not unlike the burst of intellectual life in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Educated persons are beginning to ask, not what Scripture may be made to mean, but what it does.”—p. 374.

“In Natural Science, it is felt to be useless to build on assumptions.—But in Theology it is otherwise; there the tendency has been to conceal the unsoundness of the foundation under the fairness and loftiness of the superstructure.”—p. 376.

“Again: the language in which our Saviour speaks of His own union with the Father, is interpreted by the language of the creeds. Those who remonstrate against double senses, allegorical interpretations, forced reconcilements, find themselves met by a sort of presupposition that “God speaks not as man speaks.”—It is better to close the book than to read under conditions of thought which are imposed from without.”—p. 377.

“Nor for any of the higher or *supernatural* views of inspiration is there any foundation in the Gospels or Epistles. There is no appearance in their writings that the Evangelists or the Apostles had any inward gift, or were subject to any power external to them, different from that of preaching or teaching, which they duly exercised; nor do they any where lead us to suppose that they were free from error or infirmity.—One supposes the original dwelling-place of our Lord’s parents to have been Bethlehem, (Matt. ii. 1 to 22,) another, Nazareth, (Luke ii. 4.) They trace His genealogy different ways. One mentions the thieves blaspheming. Another has preserved to after ages the record of the penitent thief. They appear to differ about the day and hour of the crucifixion. The narrative of the woman who anointed our Lord’s feet with ointment, is told in all four, each narrative having more or less considerable variations.”—p. 380.

“What is inspiration? The first answer, therefore, is, *that idea of Scripture which we gather from the knowledge of it*—it is reconcilable with attribution to the Divine Being of actions *at variance* with that higher revelation that He has given of Himself in the Gospel.—It is not inconsistent with imperfect or *opposite* aspects of truth, as in the Book of Job or Ecclesiastes; with variations of fact in

the Gospels—or the Book of Kings and Chronicles; with inaccuracies of language in the Epistles of St. Paul.”—p. 382 “The other consideration is one which has been neglected by writers on this subject. It is this—that every true doctrine of inspiration must conform to all well-ascertained facts of history or science. The same fact cannot be true and untrue, any more than the same words can have two opposite meanings.—It is ridiculous to suppose, that the sun goes round the earth in the same sense in which the earth goes round the sun; or that the world appears to have existed, but has not existed, during the vast epochs of which geology speaks to us.”—p. 383.

“Almost all intelligent persons are agreed, that the earth has existed for myriads of ages; the best informed are of opinion, that the history of nations extends back some thousands of years before the Mosaic chronology. Recent discoveries in geology may, perhaps, open a further vista of existence for the human species; while it is possible, and may one day be known, that mankind spread, *not from one*, but from many centres, over the globe; or, as others say, that the supply of links which are at present wanting in the chain of animal life, may lead to *new conclusions respecting the origin of man*. Now let it be granted that these facts, being with the past, cannot be shown in the same palpable and evident manner as the facts of chemistry or physiology—still it is a false policy to set up inspiration or revelation in opposition to them.—The sciences of geology and comparative philology are steadily gaining ground.—Shall we peril religion on the possibility of their untruth?—If it is fortunate for science, it is, perhaps, more fortunate for Christian truth, that the admission of Galileo’s discovery has forever settled the principle of the relations between them.”—p. 384. (The italics are our own.)

“The meaning of Scripture is one thing; the inspiration of Scripture is another.—Rigid upholders of the verbal inspiration of Scripture, and *those who deny inspiration altogether*, may, nevertheless, meet on the common ground of the meaning of words. If the term “inspiration,” were to fall into disuse, no fact of nature or history or language, no event in the life of man, or dealings of God with him, would be in any degree altered. The word itself is but of yesterday, not found in the earlier confessions of the reformed faith; the difficulties that have arisen out of it, are only two or three centuries old.”—p. 386.

We have quoted, in order, all the opinions which Mr. Jowett holds in regard to the Inspiration of the Bible, so as to show in connection the shallow sophistry of his objections.

He begins by assuming that there is no foundation for *Supernatural* Inspiration, (which is the very kind embraced in the idea of a Divine Revelation,) because there are apparent discrepancies in the Gospels in regard to the original home of our Lord’s parents; the thieves on the Cross; the day and hour of the Crucifixion, and the anointing of His feet; all of which are shallow cavils, easily explained. Admitting, for argument’s sake, that they could not be readily explained, he might



with equal logical force deny that a man had an indwelling soul, because his body was imperfect or deformed.

He next proceeds to give us his own very *lucid* definition of another kind of inspiration, viz.: "the idea of Scripture which we get from the knowledge of it." What that means, we cannot say; but he tells us it is consistent with any required amount of error in the Old or New Testament.

Not content with this accommodating kind of inspiration, (the definition of which is as clear as that of "lucus a non lucendo,") he refers to another consideration, neglected by writers, viz., "that any true doctrine of inspiration must conform to all well ascertained facts of history or science." In this connection he endorses the shallowest of the infidel cavils of Williams, Powell, and Goodwin, in almost the same language as these writers use.

Finally, as if aware how unsatisfactory such sophistical cavils must appear, and despairing of finding any better, he coolly tells us that, after all, the question of inspiration has nothing to do with the interpretation of the words of the Bible; the term might as well be disused, and that "rigid upholders of the verbal inspiration of Scripture, and those who deny inspiration altogether, may, nevertheless, *meet on the common ground of the meaning of words.*"

It is scarcely possible to open the Bible without finding evidence of the utter fallacy of this assertion. Take, for instance, Moses' account of the covenant with Abraham, as stated in the 15th, 17th, and 26th chapters of Genesis: the institution of Circumcision; the prediction that his seed should serve 400 years in Egypt, and afterwards should take possession of the land of Canaan; and finally, that in his seed all the nations of the earth should be blessed,—which statement is prefaced with the words: "The Lord appeared to Abram and said unto him."

Where, we ask, is the *common ground of the meaning of words* in regard to this statement, on which implicit believers and total rejecters of a divinely inspired Revelation may meet? The believer would find no difficulty in receiving as truth the plain meaning of the statement, even if there were inaccuracies in the language or other accessories; for he traces the fulfill-

ment of the statement in the Jewish history, and in an attesting commemorative rite, still existing.

But how is it with the rejecter of a supernatural Divine Revelation? If he denies the inspiration of Moses, he must either maintain that no such statement was ever made, and then account for its continuous belief by the whole Jewish nation, and the attesting evidence of our Saviour and His Apostles; or, he must seek by some quibble of philology or ideology to give it a different meaning, and in that case he must account for the facts which attest the opposite meaning and militate against his own; or, thirdly, he must also deny the facts, and assert that no such covenant was made,—no rite of circumcision commemorated it,—the Jews were not four hundred years in Egypt,—and they never took possession of the land of Canaan, as the statement predicts.

If he admit the statement to be genuine, and cannot substitute another meaning, nor disprove the facts predicted, then he must necessarily admit that Moses was supernaturally inspired; for no uninspired man could possibly foreknow the occurrence of the predicted facts.

It is therefore very apparent that the grounds assumed by the implicit believer and total rejecter of Inspiration, in their interpretation of Scripture, must differ from each other as widely as truth and error; the one believing in a *supernatural* Divine Revelation, which the other considers *preternatural* and impossible.

We will next quote a few paragraphs, to show how Mr. Jowett handles the Bible, and in what estimation he holds its doctrines, and the Creed of the Church, of which he is a Minister.

"The received translations of Phil. ii. 6, (Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God,) or of Rom. iii. 25, (Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood,) or Rom. xv. 6, (God, even the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ,) though *erroneous*, are not given up without a struggle; the I. Tim. iii. 6, and I. John v. 7, (the three witnesses,) though the first ('God was manifest in the flesh,' ΘΣ for ΟΣ, is not found in the best manuscripts, and the second, (*there are three that bear record*), in no Greek manuscript worth speaking of, have not yet disappeared from the editions of the Greek Testament commonly in use in England, and still less from the English translation."—p. 387.

Nor are they likely to, unless stronger reasons than such quibbling cavils are adduced.

"Between Scripture and the Nicene or Athanasian Creed, a world of the understanding comes in;—mankind are no longer at the same point as when the whole of Christianity was contained in the words, '*Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou mayest be saved.*'"—p. 388.

"If the occurrence of the *phraseology* of the Nicene age, in a verse of the Epistles, would *detect the spuriousness* of the verse in which it was found, how can the Nicene or Athanasian Creed be a suitable instrument for the interpretation of Scripture?"—p. 389.

Ingenious use of philology this!—proving the spuriousness of Scripture from its Nicene phraseology, in order to show that the doctrines of the Creed are inconsistent with it.

"To attribute to St. Paul, or the Twelve, the abstract notion of Christian truth, which afterwards sprang up in the Catholic Church, is the same sort of anachronism as to attribute to them a system of Philosophy."—p. 389, or,

He might have added, in accordance with his remarks elsewhere, "or to suppose they had any system of Christian doctrine."

"St. Paul—does not speak of him (Christ) as 'equal to the Father,' or, 'of one substance with the Father.'—Still greater difficulties would be introduced into the Gospels, by the attempt to identify them with the Creeds. We should have to suppose that He was and was not tempted; that when He prayed to the Father, He prayed also to Himself; that He knew and did not know 'of the hour' of which He, as well as the Angels, were ignorant. How could He have said, 'My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me,' (which, by the bye, was a quotation of the xxii. Ps., by our Saviour, to recall to the Jews the prophecy concerning him,) or, 'Father if it be possible, let this cup pass from me?' How could He have doubted whether, 'when the Son cometh, He shall find faith on the earth?'"—p. 390.

In other words, Mr. Jowett cannot understand how the God-head could empty himself of His glory,—how He could veil Himself in human flesh,—how He could take upon Him the form of a servant, to fulfill, obediently, the Law of God,—and die the death of a slave,—how God could be manifest in the flesh, and still retain the essence of Divinity;—and therefore concludes that such doctrine, whether asserted in Scripture or Creeds, must be spurious.

"In what relation does it (Scripture) stand to actual life? Is it a law, or only a spirit? for nations, or for individuals? to be enforced generally, or in details also? are its maxims to be modified by experience, or acted upon in defiance of experience?"—p. 393.

It is evident that the maxims of the Bible are as distasteful

to Mr. Jowett as its doctrines. So also are the doctrines of the Church of England—for, on the next page, he says :

"Consider, for example, the extraordinary and unreasonable importance attached to single words, sometimes of doubtful meaning, in reference to any of the following subjects: 1. Divorce; 2. Marriage with a Wife's sister; 3. Inspiration; 4. The Personality of the Holy Spirit; 5. Infant Baptism; 6. Episcopacy; 7. Divine Right of Kings; 8. Original Sin."

He advocates, separately, objections to each of these points—and in regard to the last, viz, Original Sin, he thinks it contrary to "the Justice of God, who rewardeth every man according to his works."

On page 410 he says : "It is probable that some of the preceding statements may be censured, as a wanton exposure of the difficulties of Scripture,"—to which we readily assent ; but he gives, as his excuse, "First, that the difficulties referred to are very well known ;" which we confidently deny ; and, "secondly, as the time has come when it is no longer possible to ignore the results of criticism, it is of importance that Christianity should be seen to be in harmony with them."—Which plea of *harmony*, we consider a bare-faced attempt to beg the whole question at issue between him and the Creed of his Church, which he positively rejects. His "criticism," which is precisely the same as that of all the other Essayists, attempts to harmonize Scripture with their Deistical developments, which he adopts and dubs, forsooth, with the name of Christianity. In his laborious attempts to reconcile Christianity with Infidelity, Mr. Jowett presents, not so much the painful picture of Sisyphus, rolling a huge stone up a mountain, which is a feasible though arduous operation, but he rather exhibits himself in the futile and frivolous position of a man attempting to trundle two wheel-barrows at the same time. His subsequent remarks, that such an attempt at harmony should be prompted by love for the truth, and his speculations in regard to the beauty and the freshness which the Bible would acquire, after such "a reconciliation or restoration of belief" had been effected by a criticism which aims to remove entirely from its pages the great Spirit of God, by substituting some little fancy "spirit,"—is sickening, in the mouth of a man, whose spiritual grasp of the text of God's Word does

not seem to extend beyond the technical force of "*iva*," "*γὰρ*," "*μεν*," or "*δε*." He seems utterly destitute of all perception of spiritual truth and life, and his caressing words in regard to the beauty of the language or sentiment of Scripture, sound strangely in our ears, like compliments paid to a corpse. The hopes and doubts of the Christian, his trials and struggles in the battle of life, "fightings without and fears within," are all incomprehensible to the man who says, in reference to the Apostle's testimony in regard to a well spent life of faith and devotion to the Master's cause, "We cannot, therefore, *without unreality, except, perhaps, in a very few cases*, appropriate his words, "I have fought the good fight; I have finished my course; I have kept the faith." The reader of this Essay cannot fail to feel perfectly certain, that its author is not one of those exceptional cases.

It would present an amusing contrast, to write down on one page all that this double tongued writer denies in regard to the Bible—its Inspiration, Miracles, Prophecies, Holy Spirit, Divinity and Atonement of the Saviour, including, in fact, every doctrine which would present it in any other light than that of an imperfect human production, like any other book;—and then, on the opposite side, to make a collection of such expressions as the following: "The Scriptures are a bond of union to the whole Christian world. No one denies their authority." "The *interpreter* needs nothing short of 'fashioning' in *himself* the image of the mind of Christ. He has to be *born again*, into a new spiritual or *intellectual* world, from which the thoughts of this world are shut out. It is one of the highest tasks, on which the labor of a life can be spent, to bring the words of Christ a little nearer to the heart of man."—"But, while acknowledging this inexhaustible or *infinite* character of the sacred writings, it does not therefore follow, that we are willing to admit of hidden or mysterious meanings in them." To which might be appended such foot notes as this:

"Educated men will be no more able to believe, that the words, 'Out of Egypt I have called my Son,' or, '*ipsa conteret caput tuum*,' (the seed of the woman shall bruise thy head,) refer to Christ; or, 'that the first chapter of Genesis relates the same tale which geology and ethnology unfold, than they now think the *meaning* of Josh. x. 12, 13, to be in accordance with Galileo's discovery."

Time forbids us to undertake this tempting task, or to notice the presumptuous remarks, (to use the mildest terms,) of our author, in regard to the perverted and erroneous employment of Scripture in the Epistles, "*though sanctioned by our Lord and His Apostles*,"—p. 449 ; as well as in regard to the "hair splitting" of St. Paul, and the many errors of the Apostolic (early and later) Church, the framers of our Creed, upon whose understanding, he asserts, there was a veil.—p. 465.

But we will close our criticism of this Essay, with a single quotation, for the purpose of showing what reliance can be placed upon Mr. Jowett's candor and correctness, in his reference to Scripture, and critical interpretation of it :

"No one would interpret Scripture as many do, but for certain previous suppositions, with which *we* come to the perusal of it." "There can be no error in the word of God," therefore the discrepancies in the Books of Kings and Chronicles are only apparent, or may be attributed to differences in the copies. "It is a thousand times more likely, that the interpreter should err, than the inspired writer." For a like reason, the *failure of a prophecy* is never admitted, in spite of Scripture and of history ; (Jer. xxxvi. 30 ; Isa. xxiii. ; Amos vii. 10-17 :) the mention of a name later than the supposed age of the Prophet is not allowed, as in other writings, to be taken in evidence of the date.—(Isa. xlv. 1.)

We take several grave exceptions to this, seemingly, innocent and very plausible paragraph.

The first is, the quiet and sly assumption, on the part of the writer, that there can be no inspiration in the Word of God, and that the contrary opinion is founded on sheer *supposition* ; for, otherwise, it would be most natural and proper for those who hold the doctrine of inspiration to conclude, that the Word of God can teach no error, and that interpreters are far more apt to err than the Holy Spirit. The second is, the equally quiet and sly assumption, that there are irreconcilable discrepancies in the Books of Kings and Chronicles, which this baseless *supposition* leads us, very unreasonably, to attempt to defend or explain.

The third is, the assumption, that this same baseless *suppo-*

sition prevents our admitting the palpable and acknowledged failure of *pretended* prophecies.

The fourth is, the very casual way in which three prophecies are indicated, (merely by chapter and verse,) as *signal proofs* of the grievous errors into which *we* fall in our interpretation of Scripture, by coming to the perusal of it with certain previous suppositions in regard to its inspiration, so baseless that it requires no opposing argument; and this, too, is hazarded, under the presumption, that nobody will take the trouble to hunt up these flagrant instances of pretended prophecies.

Now, Mr. Jowett, and all these Essayists, are perfectly aware, (and they give abundant evidence of it,) that their entire system of *free handling* hinges on the question of Supernatural Inspiration. He and they are also perfectly aware, that if a well-established case of a single fulfilled prophecy can be adduced, this question is forever settled, and that God has, in that instance, supernaturally used the mouth of man. It is the special task of Dr. Williams to show, that all the Messianic prophecies have disappeared, save two, and they are fast melting away in the crucible of searching enquiry. For Mr. Jowett, in the face of this fact, to steal into our ranks by his insidious use of the word "*we*," and slyly assume what he was bound to prove, or at least to argue, is an insult to our understanding, unworthy of a scholar or a man. We, however, are not of the number who consider it safe to take Mr. Jowett's assumptions, or his references, without examination. We will, therefore, examine these three signal failures of prophecy, which, in his opinion, so completely prove the error of previous suppositions of Divine Inspiration, as to require a bare reference to them, and nothing more.

The first is Jer. xxxvi. 30. "Therefore, thus saith the Lord of Jehoiakim, king of Judah; He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David; and his dead body shall be cast out in the day to the heat, and in the night to the frost." Jehoiakim died in captivity, and his dead body, by the order of Nebuchadnezzar, was cast forth, without burial, before the walls of Jerusalem.

Isaiah xxiii. This chapter foretells the destruction of Tyre—which prophecy was most remarkably fulfilled.



Amos vii. 10-17. The unfulfilled prophecy, referred to here, we suppose, is the following: "For thus Amos saith, Jeroboam shall die by the sword, and Israel shall surely be led away captive, out of their own land." Jeroboam did not die by the sword, nor did Amos predict that he should. But he predicted that God would "rise against the house of Jeroboam with the sword," and that Israel should be laid waste, which was literally fulfilled by the invasion and final overthrow of the kingdom, by the Assyrians. The above-quoted words, which seem to show a failure of prophecy, *are the words which the idolatrous priest of Bethel falsely represented to the king, as having been spoken by Amos, the Prophet of God!*

These are the three prophecies which Mr. Jowett cites, as self-evident attestations of the fallacy of a supposed Inspiration! We are justified in inferring, that they are the strongest he could find, otherwise he would not have cited them in this connection.

But there remains to be noticed, in the above quotation, a still stronger instance of the value and reliability of that criticism, which Mr. Jowett so vauntingly recommends, as necessary to ascertain the "one only true meaning" of the Scriptures, by means of which, "could all be brought to an intelligence of their true meaning, all might come to agree in matters of religion." It is scarcely necessary to say, that this hope of Mr. Jowett would be fully realized, if all would only consent to accept his method of interpretation, for they would find in the Bible no spiritual doctrine on which to differ.

The passage we refer to, is the closing one of the above quotations, which refers to Isaiah xlv. 1. "Thus saith the Lord to His Anointed, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden, to subdue nations before him;" in regard to which, Mr. Jowett remarks: "*the mention of a name later than the supposed age of the Prophet, is not allowed, as in other writings, to be taken in evidence of the date.*"

This, all the attendant circumstances considered, is the most insidiously monstrous, and, at the same time, (to use an English synonym for a more appropriate word of Latin origin,) the

most *shameless* *petitio principii*, which can be found in this book, abounding, as it does, in sophistical assumptions.

Mr. Jowett is arguing, in his *hinting* style, against such false modes of interpreting the Bible as are based on the idea, that there can be no error in the Word of God, and which are derived from previous suppositions of its Divine Inspiration. In this connection, he cites the three prophecies which we have just examined, as *failures*, and, with what truth, the reader can judge. In further proof of error in the Word of God, and of our unreasonable mode of interpreting it, he cites the prophecy concerning Cyrus, (which, as a verified prediction, incontestably proves the fact of Divine Inspiration,) and tells us, with the utmost coolness, that the mention of a name later than the supposed age of the prophet is not allowed, as in other writings, to be taken in evidence of the date. In other words, it is very unreasonable for those who believe in Inspiration, not to admit, as they would in the case of any other book, that this *prediction* is a great error, since it mentions the name of a person not then in existence!

To understand the insidious sophistry covered by the apparent non-chalance of this very cool remark, it is necessary to point out all the assumptions which it embraces, to suit different classes of sceptical objectors, for whom Mr. Jowett is catering.

First,—it assumes that this prediction, like the preceding ones, was a *failure*, and therefore it is a proof against Inspiration.

Secondly,—it assumes that the text is a history of the past— notwithstanding the flat contradiction which its phraseology gives to such a view—and therefore furnishes a proof of the fallacy of interpreting it as a prophecy of the future.

Thirdly,—it assumes that the whole passage is *spurious*, since it mentions a name later than the age of the writer.— Otherwise it would be a prediction,—which would prove Inspiration,—and this would prevent us from *interpreting the Scriptures like any other book*,—which would prove Mr. Jowett's infallible rule utterly worthless, and this, of course, would be tantamount to a *reductio ad absurdum*, according to Mr. Jowett:—therefore the passage must be *spurious*.

Charity can find no excuse in the plea of inadvertence for such artful assumptions of what ought to have been proved, in regard to a question of vital importance, and upon which the subject of his Essay hinged. For the above quotation is but a sample of this writer's method of handling and interpreting Scripture, and of the insidious, hinting sophistry which pervades the whole Essay, laying traps for unwary souls, and suggesting doubts at every step, even when he is proposing the words of Job, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," as a beautiful expression, to be used by the side of a death-bed, "though the exact meaning of them (he adds in a parenthesis) may be doubtful to a Hebrew scholar."

The constant profession of a tender concern for true religion, as opposed to the errors of the Church, and of all orthodox believers, from the Apostles, downwards; the oft repeated expressions of admiration for the Bible, while every effort is made to represent it as an imperfect and erroneous human production; the pathetic yearnings, that the whole Christian world, both believers and total rejecters of Inspiration, may finally come to an agreement in regard to its one only true meaning, by the aid of a harmonizing criticism of its words;—in a word, the continual intermingling of evangelical expressions, and even the cant of belief, with sophistical inculcations of the most sceptical Infidelity,—is the disgusting feature of this Essay.

Our parting word to the author is, that when, in accordance with his negations of the doctrines, he shall have resigned his position as Presbyterian of the Church of England; and when, in accordance with his adoption of their sentiments, he shall have come out frankly, and have taken his proper place by the side of Hume, Voltaire and Paine;—he will then acquire a title to respect, which he does not now possess.

We have now passed in careful review these seven reformers of the Christian religion—all of whom, save one, are the duly appointed ministers of Christ—who have sworn to uphold the Creed of the Church of England,—who have vowed before God, that they "unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament," and that these "con-

tain all Doctrine necessary for eternal salvation, through faith in Jesus Christ," and have "determined, by God's grace," out of the said Scriptures, to instruct the people, and to teach nothing but what may be proved by the Scriptures.

These seven have combined together to produce *a book*, of which they all, in a special, joint notice to the public, say: "The volume, it is hoped, will be received as an attempt to illustrate the advantage derivable to the cause of religion and moral truth from a free handling, in a becoming spirit, of subjects peculiarly liable to suffer by the repetition of conventional language, and from traditional methods of treatment."

The "volume," thus jointly commended, teaches, as plainly as words can teach, that the Scriptures are not the Inspired Word of God—that they contain no outer law of faith or practice, no spiritual doctrine necessary to salvation;—that the Bible is not genuine, even as a human production, and that it is full of erroneous, absurd, and incredible statements; and, that the Creeds founded upon it are inherited from a superstitious and ignorant age, and are unworthy of belief in our enlightened day. Each of these Essayists rejects the fact of a Supernatural Revelation, and the supernatural evidence which attests this fact. They, one and all, maintain the supremacy of man's natural Reason, as the only means to determine his duty to God and his fellow, and as sufficient to satisfy all the spiritual wants of the soul, both in regard to its present natural state, and in reference to its future supernatural existence, so far, at least, as they acknowledge a God, and a future state, which some of them seem to doubt.

Three great fallacies of thought pervade the writings of all these Essayists. The first is the belief, that what is supernatural must also, necessarily, be *preternatural*. The second is the opinion, that imperfection in the human frame-work of Revelation precludes the idea of its being the tenement of the Holy Spirit. The third is the assumption, that human Reason is capable of explaining all the mysterious dealings and designs of God, and therefore, if a pretended Revelation conflicts with, or transcends Reason, it must, necessarily, be spurious. This amounts to a declaration, on their part, that God is *finite*,

and Reason is *infallible*. There is not one of these Essayists, who could give us a reasonable solution of the simplest problem connected with their physical organization, and yet they aim to solve, by Reason, the problems of their spiritual nature, and fathom the counsels of the Infinite in regard to it. They must give some better evidence of the *supremacy* of this faculty, than what is displayed in these Essays, before they can hope to persuade sensible men to adopt their absurd theories.

They claim the name of *Rationalists*, in its abstract and best sense, as descriptive of their character as reformers; but, in reality, reason has very little to do, either with their merits or their errors, so far as they themselves are concerned. This new mode of thought is but a rehash of very old and exploded forms of Infidelity,—or the re-assertion of views which have been much better and more honestly stated by infidels of the last century, with just enough of modern Germanism, to make it popular and obscure. We have been unable to find a single original argument or train of thought, in any of their productions, and despite of their confident appeals to science and modern knowledge, the sciolism of their scholarship makes one feel, that “a little knowledge is a dangerous thing,” and that it is much safer not to taste, or else to “drink deep of the Pierian spring.” It would be a libel upon reason to attribute their many errors, as in any manner arising from a legitimate use and proper application of that faculty.

“In *pride*, in reas'ning pride (their) error lies;  
All quit their sphere, and rush into the skies.”

The human reason imperatively demands an external, supernatural, Divine Revelation, and the proof of this assertion is contained in the fact, that no nation has ever existed upon this earth without its faith in the supernatural. There are many and strong reasons why it should demand such a Revelation, some of which we will state in brief.

1st.—The natural religious constitution of man,—that consciousness of a spiritual existence, and of its dependence on some higher power, is constantly manifesting an instinctive craving after knowledge relating to his spiritual existence, which his bodily senses are unable to satisfy. It is as abhorrent

to reason to suppose that God would create the soul with this instinctive craving, and deny it the light of Revelation, as it would be to suppose that He created the eye and denied it the light necessary for vision. Therefore the traditions of every nation that has ever existed, attest the original communication of a Divine Revelation, though man "has sought out many inventions" to pervert this knowledge.

2d.—The immortality of the soul, and its responsibility to its Creator, require a revealed knowledge of His will, upon which to base conscience and moral obligation.

3d.—The soul being immortal, its future destiny must necessarily be an object of solicitude to the mind, and human reason requires that such solicitude shall be relieved in the only possible way, viz., by the Inspired Word of God.

4th.—The existence of a depraved nature, blinding our perceptions, blunting our moral sense, warping our judgments, and rendering reason a powerless guide, demands the controlling influence of an "outer law." It needs not Revelation to tell us, that the heart is desperately wicked—every man's experience testifies to this point, and the language of the inspired Apostle is unconsciously reiterated by the heathen poet, "*Video meliora, proboque, sed deteriora sequor.*"

5th.—The complete failure of the ablest minds, in the most enlightened of the heathen nations, to arrive at any truth in regard to man's spiritual nature, and the fruitless attempts of the acutest reasoners and the profoundest thinkers, to devise any system of ethics or religion, which could satisfy even the demands of their own times, prove conclusively, that this knowledge must be derived from another source than the human mind.

Many other arguments might be adduced to show, that the human reason demands instruction on subjects of vital concernment, which its own powers are utterly incapable of investigating, and a knowledge of which can only be obtained from a Divinely Inspired Revelation.

But what is the objection which these Essayists make to that Revelation, which we claim to have received from God,—which, from the time of Moses to the present day, has been

the parent of the only true civilization which has existed in the world, and which has never yet, in a single instance, disappointed the hopes of those who have put their trust in it? The chief, if not the only one having any semblance of validity is, that its attestations are miraculous and supernatural. The question of supernatural interference, either as relating to Inspiration, Miracles, Prophecies, authoritative Doctrines, or incredible narratives, covers the whole ground of their objections. This question they do not attempt to treat upon its own merits, as a question of *fact*, but they discard it, by the assumption, that it is contrary to Reason and Modern Science!

We can sympathize, from experience, with the man who, in the name of Science, questions a Miracle, and demands convincing proof of the fact of its occurrence; but not with one who, in the name of Reason, refuses to admit as evidence the fact of a Miracle in attestation of a supernatural Revelation, because it transcends his reason. Such rationalism, could it not be traced directly to pride of Reason, would rightly be considered mental imbecility. But the question of *fact* they have not touched. They assume, that a supernatural Revelation is contrary to reason, and therefore impossible; accordingly, they set themselves to work, some to eliminate from the sacred text its Miraculous attestations, by strange ideal and forced philological interpretations, while others strain their mighty intellect to prove, that a Miracle is an interference with the order of Nature, and therefore impossible, or, that the effects of laws impressed on matter, before the present arrangement of our solar system, are repugnant to Modern Science, and therefore incredible. Let these seven remodel their attack, and by a second concert of independent action, produce another book, which shall prove, that the Miracles which attest Revelation never occurred,—that the detailed accounts of them are falsehoods or forgeries—or that they were true statements of juggling tricks, deceiving an ignorant age,—then will we admit their proceeding to be a reasonable one, and that they have some just claim to the title of Rational. After such an attempt has proved successful, and not before, will we admit a reasonable right to interpret “the Scripture like any other book;”



and, with this preliminary point settled, such an interpretation would enable them to arrive, fairly and reasonably, at the same conclusions which they now aim at, by absurd theories of interpretation, or illogical sophisms. For it would be then easy to show, that the Bible is the most stupendous bundle of absurdities and falsehoods, that was ever palmed upon the credulity of mankind; "the most uncertain of all books," to guide man to moral truth, and completely justifying the position of all these Essayists, that the only safe rule for educated men, in these enlightened times, is the "supremacy of Reason." All that would then be required of these Rationalists by a grateful world, would be, to continue the same reasonable process, and account for the admitted fact, that this Book has continued through all ages to mold, instruct, console and elevate mankind. It would not be strange if such an attempt, fairly conducted, should force them, by its difficulties, to acknowledge the supernatural Divine origin of the Bible, as the most logical conclusion. What evidence, we would ask, other than a Miraculous one, would properly attest a supernatural Revelation? The human reason demands precisely such kind of evidence, and will be satisfied with no other. Suppose a man of pure life and sound mind should arise in our midst, and solemnly proclaim, that he was commissioned, supernaturally, to announce a message from the Deity. There being no question of his integrity or sanity, what evidence would we require to attest his supernatural claim? We would most certainly say to him, "If you claim to be supernaturally endowed as the ambassador of God, present your credentials;—give us such evidence of this claim, as our senses and our reason can take cognizance of, that we may believe, when you say, "Thus saith the Lord." If such a one, by word or touch, should *really* open the eyes of the blind, restore the withered limb, raise the dead to life, or predict the future, reason would compel us to admit, that the Deity, who thus supernaturally accredited him, had also supernaturally endowed him as His messenger. If he should fail in this attempt, we would justly rank him either as a lunatic or an impostor. The fact that no nation has ever existed without a religious belief based upon the supernatural, and

claiming Miraculous attestation of its truth, is proof that the necessity for a faith of this kind is implanted in human nature, and that human reason demands just such evidence to support it. As the religion of the Bible is the only one that has ever stood the test of reason and experience, so are its Miracles the only ones that can stand the test of scrutiny. All others are but shams and counterfeits, easily detected, and readily exposing the superstitions that they are designed to uphold.

We now take leave of these Essayists and their pernicious book. We have studied carefully their views, and have endeavored to represent them with clearness and candor. We make no apology for the severity of our language, for it is the honest expression of our abhorrence of their mingled impiety and sophistry; nor has it in any instance been used wantonly, but always in logical connection with the detection of error. After a careful perusal, in the proofs, of all that has been written, there is but one expression which we would wish to expunge, and would have done so had we been aware of it before the type was distributed. It is the remark in regard to Baron Bunsen, in which we refer to the German nation as "a plodding race." It escaped our pen in a moment of irritation in regard to German Rationalism, whose elaborately learned puerilities we detest as much as its impiety. The remark, however, though an honest expression of *opinion*, was logically unnecessary, and does seeming injustice to a nation which has produced many of the noblest intellects. We regret its use, and now make all the atonement in our power. With this confession of our error, we claim no exemption from proper rebuke, on the ground that, "to err is human,—to forgive, divine."

There remains but one question to be considered: what will be the effect of this book? The Introductory notice by its Unitarian editor shows the delight with which it is hailed by that sect. Avowed infidels will gloat over its pages, and recognize in its authors able coadjutors and kindred spirits. No sound churchman, or mature Bible Christian, will receive the slightest detriment from its perusal. But there are two classes in our country, with whom it will be a powerful engine for mischief. The first is, that (too numerous) class of preach-

ers, who, with quick parts and active minds, lack the correctives of a sound erudition and stable principles. They are, as we have remarked on another occasion, the scatter-brain proclaimers of what may be called a mixed eclectic Gospel, composed of religion, rationalism, politics, and philanthropy, who perhaps, in sincerity, think they are preaching Christ, when in reality they are preaching, with fervid vehemence, for popular applause, their own irreverent individualities. These men, when they meet any thing in the Bible which opposes some favorite notion of politics or philanthropy, are ever ready, in the language of one who is a type of the class, to "let it go to the desolating armies of its enemies." Such men will find in this book an easy method to escape the coercive restraints of the Bible, and plenty of wind with which to fill the sails which they weekly trim for popular applause. For them we can do nothing.

But there is another class, for whom we feel the deepest concern and sympathy, and for whom this book seems to have been especially designed. They are the young and ardent inquirers after theological truth; young men, perhaps just entering the ministry, in the first blush of their intellectual prime. Conscious of the budding promise of future mental power, they resent—alas! we know how keenly—any shackle upon free thought, or any attempt to confine within bounds the full exercise of their untrained intellectual powers. To them the constant appeals which this book makes to their pride of reason, is full of seductive danger. To such we would say, "Are you willing to abandon the Faith of your fathers, to deny your Saviour, and forego those glorious hopes of a blessed immortality which the Bible unfolds, for the present gratification of a proud philosophy, falsely so called?" The answer doubtless will be,—God forbid! Then we would say: Lay down this dangerous book, till your powers are more matured; or, if you will read, do it with your eyes open, and with the full conviction, that, if you lend a willing ear to the seductive appeals which these writers make to your intellectual pride, and if you admit, unquestioned, the sophistry of their premises, you cannot logically stop till you reach the Deism to which they have all attained, and the blank Atheism to which they are all hastening.

## ART. VI.—CHURCH MISSIONS IN NEW YORK CITY.

*Annual Report of the Protestant Episcopal Mission to Public Institutions in the City of New York.*

BETWEEN eleven and twelve years ago, some of the Rectors and Communicants of our City Churches, dissatisfied with the general usage among us of opening the House of Prayer only on the Lord's Day, were in the habit of meeting daily for the celebration of Public Worship. In certain of our Churches this custom, new to this generation and Church and country, had already for some years obtained and found favor. At the time however of which we now speak, one after another had been added to the number of Churches open for Daily Worship, amid somewhat of excitement, discussion and opposition. Some advocated the practice earnestly, others as strenuously opposed it. Like many another movement, good in itself, its own merits were lost sight of, and it was advocated by some in connection with usages with which it had really no necessary connection: opposed by others in part, because of the system to which it seemed to them to belong, in part perhaps because of the persons by whom it was here introduced. In short, like many another subject, although having no necessary connection with any party in the Church, it became a party question, and its true merits were lost to sight.

The Rev. W. Richmond, of blessed memory, was a man above all party, a Churchman who, throughout his whole life, loved what was Christ-like wherever found, and was ready equally to follow or lead in what seemed to him to be good. He saw in the opening of the Churches for Daily Prayer, not only an appearance and means of greater devotion, but a greater self-sacrifice on the part of the Clergyman who each day at the appointed hour led the prayers of those assembled, than on the part of those of the Clergy who opened their Churches only on Sundays. It may be, also, that he had in mind the example, not only of the Early Church, but of the

zealous, untiring Henry Venn, who, in one of his country Parishes, was accustomed to hold a Daily Service, not in his Church, but at evening in the kitchen of his own house, where he gathered, at the close of their day's labor, as many work-people and others from the neighborhood as would give heed to his call.

In thinking over the subject with reference to his own duty, Mr. Richmond for a time hesitated as to his course. If two or three should desire to gather for Daily Prayer, he was ready to meet with them, whether in the Church or from house to house. Yet, it could not escape the attention of one who had to an uncommon degree the gift of looking at a subject from every side, and in every light, that the few who would meet for Daily Service would be among the most devout and best circumstanced ; whereas, amid the wickedness and woe of this naughty world, the time and power of Christ's Ministers ought, it would seem, to be chiefly given to saving men from sin and relieving suffering. By the Holy Spirit of God, Mr. Richmond's attention was at this time directed to the Public Institutions of our city, then unvisited, except occasionally, by any Clergyman of our Church, some of them seldom receiving a Minister of any denomination within their walls. He expressed it as his opinion, that, by taking the time required to maintain a Daily Service, and devoting it to labor in some of the Charitable Institutions of our City, he should be better serving his Master and his brethren, than by the introduction of more frequent Services into his own Parish. Accordingly, having obtained the necessary permission, he commenced a Weekly Service at the New York Orphan Asylum, containing about two hundred children, and, at the City Lunatic Asylum, on Blackwell's Island, another, which was attended by about seventy persons, among them some who in former years had been under Mr. Richmond's ministry. At his suggestion, his Assistant began at about the same time to visit twice each week the Colored Home, holding Service in the Chapel, and visiting the sick in the Wards.

Such is the history of the origin of the Mission to Public Institutions. In writing out this account for the present

occasion, we have relied chiefly upon memory. Although the reasons given by Mr. Richmond for making this labor his, are well fixed in our mind, owing to the fact that the subject was thoroughly discussed in his family, of which we were at the time an inmate, very possibly we may have unwittingly ourselves supplied some of the connecting thoughts. The main facts, however, are as has been stated. The institution of Daily Service led Mr. Richmond to ask if he were doing all that he ought and could. The result of his thought was the planning and commencing of this Mission.

Mr. Richmond continued to visit and hold Services in the Lunatic and Orphan Asylums, until his departure upon the Oregon Mission. In the meantime, however, the Alms House had been added to the field of labor, a Weekly Service being established there, and the Holy Communion occasionally administered, in Chapel and at the bedside, to those desiring to partake.

After Mr. Richmond's return, broken in health, from the shores of the Pacific, he was for a time unable to perform any Ministerial duties. With his returning strength, his desire to be engaged in some Missionary labor led him to visit, upon Blackwell's Island, the Penitentiary, the Work House and the Institution now known as the Island Hospital, holding also frequent, and when able, Daily Services in the House of Mercy. With the consent of the authorities, he made arrangements for Services, occupying the whole of one Sunday in each month, in the Penitentiary, the Alms House, and the Work House, preaching on those Sundays to more than fifteen hundred prisoners and outcasts, among whom were about sixty Communicants of our Church, whom age or sickness had cast upon the Public Charity.

His return to his Parish enabled his Assistant to open a Mission to Randall's Island, containing at the time about twelve hundred children in the City's care. The Leake and Watts Orphan House was also visited, and a Weekly Service commenced there. All of the Institutions named have continued part of our Missionary field, from the time of commencing the Services to the present day. Occasional visits have been

made to other of our Public Charities : as however we have not yet been able to establish regular Services, excepting in the places named, we have not thought it worth while to enumerate them now. The Institutions regularly visited at present are therefore the same to which this Mission has directed its attention for the last seven years. Notwithstanding that this is the case, the Mission for these seven years has by no means stood still. Our desire has been rather to make the Mission effective in the field occupied, than merely to extend its area. To this end we have accepted all opportunities furnished us for gathering the inmates of these various Charities in the Chapels, or Rooms for Service, with which many of them are provided : but more especially has it been our aim to minister faithfully and fully to the sick. Two of our principal Hospitals, containing together about fifteen hundred beds, receive into their Wards very many who pass their days sadly removed from every holy influence. Some of them have never been taught of Christ, others have quite forsaken Him. If there be ever a time when the Gospel is welcome to such, it is while they lie, lonely and sick or dying, in a Public Hospital. As we have been able, therefore, we have increased our labors in these Hospitals, until the present time, when each is visited regularly by a Clergyman thrice in the week, and frequently also by a female Bible Reader who gives to each a portion of her time.

Another institution claiming our tender care, is the Alms House, in which are gathered many hundreds whom natural incapacity, or old age, or some infirmity or misfortune has driven to its shelter. In this common home of the poor, we find many brethren of our own household, members, by Baptism or Communion, of the Episcopal Church. Scattered as they are more or less throughout all the departments of Public Charity, they form at the Alms House a little Church by themselves. Never shall we forget the happy day when, under this Mission, the opening Service of our Church was held in the Alms House Chapel. Tears of joy and thanksgiving fell from the aged eyes of those who had never hoped to join again upon earth in the loved Worship of their childhood's Church. It was like the gladness that filled the soul of the aged Simeon, when



that Christ whom he always bore in his heart, shed the light of His earthly presence upon his sight.

We have seldom less than forty, at times as many as seventy communicants. While the greater number of the members of our Church at the Alms House are emigrants from England and Ireland, this is by no means the case with all. The changes and chances of life lead thither from our midst some, once of high standing in society, some whom we ourselves have formerly known. This is also the case in a less degree in other Charities, as the City Lunatic Asylum, Bellevue Hospital and the Orphan Asylum, in all of which are to be found those, or the children of those, who once bore a good name in mercantile ranks, in social circles, and in the Church. There are many connected in memory with our own earlier years, now lost to our sight. Sometimes, as we meet a friend of our youth, and in imagination live over together its light hearted days, we wonder what has become of this one or that, of whom we have long had no tidings. We remember of some, that their parents met with losses; of others, that they were unsuccessful in their first trials in the work of life. Some of the young men we know became dissipated; some of the young women married bad husbands. But they have passed out of our sight, and this is the last we have been able to learn. Who will join the broken thread, and give us their story and tell us now where they are?

Theirs may be the tale familiar to our Missionaries. Those who met with misfortune, or had cause for shame, shrank from their former friends, and struggled on, ever sinking, until, in some Alms House or Public Hospital, they laid themselves down upon a pauper's bed. There we found them, spoke to them of Christ: they were comforted and died: in the solitary dead house we said over their remains those words in which we commit to earth the bodies of our departed, but there was present no friendly eye to weep; no living tongue to say, Amen. These are no fancies, but painful, every day realities.

The following is a brief summary of our public labors. The sick wards at Bellevue Hospital have been visited throughout the year, semi-weekly, and, for the last quarter, thrice in each

week. Of the 1,000 patients in this Institution, there are, on an average, fifty persons receiving each week the ministrations of our Missionary.

Chapel Services are held weekly in the Colored Home, the New York Orphan Asylum, the House of Mercy ; and, semi-monthly, at the Leake and Watts Orphan House. These Institutions are all under the management of private corporations whose members interest themselves in the spiritual welfare of those committed to their charge. The zealous ladies of the Colored Home have a duly-appointed chaplain. The other establishments named in this paragraph are not visited regularly by any clergy, other than those connected with our Mission. Every kindness and facility is tendered our Missionaries wherever their Services are held. The inmates of these charitable houses, present each week at our Services, number not less than 400.

There is also a Weekly Service in the chapel of the Alms House, and at the City Lunatic Asylum on Blackwell's Island, with an average attendance of 150.

On the second Sunday in each month, Morning Service is held in the Penitentiary chapel, at which are present 800 prisoners ; and in the afternoon of the same day, in the Alms House chapel, where are gathered 250 inmates of that Institution. There are here about 75 communicants, to whom the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is administered six times in the year.

Every fourth Sunday, Services are held among the children of Randall's Island, in number about 850 ; and also at the House of Detention.

Besides these stated Services, one of our Missionaries visits Blackwell's Island twice each month, on Sunday, holding Services at such points as may be designated by the Chaplain. In addition to the Departments already named, these occasional Services have been held in the wards of the Island Hospital, containing several hundred patients ; and also in the Work-house chapel, " where," reports the Rev. L. Coleman, " I have addressed over 1,200 men and women, telling them of Christ Jesus coming into the world to save sinners."

To what has been already told may be added this, that with-

in seven years, there have died, in our Alms Houses, three Ministers of the Gospel, not of our Church. One, a venerable hoary-headed man, buried by us, was, so far as we know, without reproach: the second, aged and blind, always gave us a cheerful welcome, and gladly heard and talked of the Good Shepherd. Of the third, a wanderer, we can only say, that, visited in his illness by one of our Missionaries, he died in a Public Hospital.

It is often objected by those, whose aid or sympathy is sought for this Mission, that men's sins bring them to this poverty. Generally it is so. We meet with some who are only, as we say, unfortunate. The greater part can trace their poverty to their own sin. And what then? Christ, our Lord, said of those upon whom the Tower of Siloam fell and slew them, and of those Galileans whose blood Pilate mingled with their sacrifices, that they were not sinners above all their countrymen, adding to those who heard him, "except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish;" not, indeed, meaning that they should be crushed by falling towers, and slain by foreign hands, but that, whether here or hereafter, God would visit unrepented sin. The sufferings of these our brethren, bring many a wandering heart home to God. They may be as Lazarus, we as rich men; we having our good things here, they being comforted hereafter. Even though every one of those, for whom our Mission cares, were what he is, because he has been worse than we, we must yet visit them, and minister. God, in His mercy chastening them, has brought many a sad heart to a blessed rest in Christ. We are not following Christ, are not merciful, like Him, if where His mercy has brought them, and His Spirit is striving with them, we leave them outcast, neglected.

There are connected with this Mission four working Clergy,\* two of whom are paid from its Treasury, a third supported by the Church of the Incarnation, New York. Two laymen assist in certain of the Departments. One Bible woman employed by the Mission, visits in the female Wards of the Hos-

---

\* These Clergy are the Rev. T. M. Peters, the Rev. C. E. Phelps, the Rev. T. K. Coleman, the Rev. Leighton Coleman.

pitals, and of the Alms Houses. There are present, each month, at our Services, between three and four thousand persons, and not less than twenty thousand in the course of the whole year. By the kindness of individuals and of various Publishing Societies in the city, the Mission is always well supplied with Bibles, Prayer Books and Tracts, and has also been enabled to place, in five of the Institutions, Libraries of devotional and other religious works, for the use of the inmates.

The preaching of the Gospel is not, however, our only work among the poor. Jesus Christ went about doing good; preaching His kingdom, calling to repentance, telling of Heaven and His glory, yet, He had time to aid the sufferers: the sick were healed, the maimed made whole, mourners were comforted, the hungry fed. Such is the example He has left to us. In our endeavors, in this Mission, to follow Christ, though by far off footstep, we could not be content to go to these vast refuges of the poor, and merely tell of Christ, and all He did, as though to make them weep that Christ is no longer here. We have done what we could to convince that Christ is still here, and that we and they are of His Kingdom, not alone in good words, but in good deeds. We were at no loss as to what we might do; the only question was, where shall we begin. A universal dread of those dying in our Public Institutions, particularly the women, is, that if buried at all, they shall be roughly and heartlessly buried in the Potter's field. It was so often the special request of dying women, that we would give them Christian burial, that this Mission early made provision for burying our own Communicants. We remembered how, when Christ died upon the felon's cross, the Holy Spirit moved Joseph and Nicodemus to give him a rich man's burial, and we thought we should be doing well to comfort the dying by the promise that we would bear away their dead bodies to a quiet grave. Communicants and members of our Church dying in the Institutions, so far as known, are buried at our expense: the number so buried during the year past was thirty five.

We find also in these Institutions, many used to better things, who, when ill, turn from the rough fare provided, and

long for something to suit their sick tastes : a little tea or some slight delicacy is received most gratefully. Now and then we find a person, in the Wards of some Public institution, who needs but a very little help at the outset, to be enabled to live by his own exertions. We find wanderers whom a small sum will carry to their homes. To give to our Missionaries the means of aiding the sick and the poor in these various wants, we have set apart a Charity Fund, to which some have contributed, out of which many have been relieved.

To show the kind of work which our Missionaries are often called to do, we give a few extracts from the statement of the Rev. T. K. Coleman. He says ;

"Scenes of touching interest are presented daily. In the Penitentiaries are often found persons, who are rather sinned against than sinning, and whose statements are corroborated by the testimony of respectable men ; and although they may be called prisoners, and herded with 'fellows of the baser sort,' they are yet thought worthy of the Holy Communion, and all other Offices of the Church of Christ ; men and women, whose lives exhibit the power of the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and, in death, witness, even in their prison dress, 'a good confession.'

So also it is no uncommon thing for parents to send inquiries for long lost children, whom they had neglected and abandoned, but when touched by the Holy Spirit and made to feel their own moral need, then they seek to save their offspring. The Missionaries often are called to read the letters of such reformed culprits, transformed into the image of Christ ; and, if the writing is imperfect, and the orthography defective, the touching rhetoric that Grace has inspired, renders their words of exhortation eloquent indeed.

Scenes and histories of betrayed females might be given, of their struggles for a life of purity and industry, and of the fiendish arts of base men and women to drag them back to a life of sin and shame. But lest we overstep the path of delicacy, we forbear.

There is also another class,—injured wives,—who find in this Mission an agency of consolation. It is sad to hear the story of vice and crime that has for its subject a weak, imprisoned woman, and for its author an unprincipled villain, who walks at large, the unpunished and unreprieved author of his wife's shame and guilt. It is a sad sight, too, to see the poor, faithful Christian woman, whose discipleship to Christ has been an honor to the Church for years, wasting away of a loathesome and shameful disease, a martyr to her husband's impure lusts."

"Of hundreds of instances, which often stir up our feelings of sympathy and indignation, we mention the following, which recently occurred. Among a group of men arrested and imprisoned in a gloomy cell, I noticed an old man of sixty years of age, whose thin visage indicated his rapid descent to the grave. His answers were almost unintelligible by his sobs of distress ; but, gathering enough of his case to inspire confidence in his worthiness, I asked for references. These he gave, and in the locality where he had lived for many years, all testified to his integrity. He was a laboring man, of infirm health, but industrious habits, and for thirty-five

years had been a member of the Lutheran Church. He had returned home after a hard day's work, to find a serpent coiled at his fire-side, and his wife a shameless adulteress. Maddened with grief and rage, an affray followed. The guilty pair, to screen themselves, procured his arrest for assault, and, when I saw him, it was in prison for such a cause. His neighbors had missed him from his usual walks, but knew no more. They and your Missionary at length obtained his acquittal, and then secured for him again an opportunity to support himself by his industry.

It would be easy to fill volumes with incidents taken from real life, surpassing, in all that is hideous, and awful, and harrowing to the sensibilities, any thing that the reader can possibly imagine. For no pure mind can fathom the depths of infamy, into which the human heart is capable of descending. Two or three portraits we had intended to sketch, but we pass them by. Indeed, we have been greatly tempted to unmask hypocrisy in some flagrant cases, as we have seen it stalk unblushingly; and yet, to do it would destroy forever the peace of some domestic circles, and plunge some now happy families into the deepest misery.

Among the imperative needs which this Mission has brought before the Missionary, one is, some way by which those may be assisted who really wish to reform, and by honest industry lead a virtuous life. For them we want employment and a Home.

Another need is, a thorough system of Christian Education for the young whom this Mission could thus reach, and save from the doom which now inevitably awaits them.

We want clothing of all kinds, for men, women, and children. Many who come to the Islands are almost naked; and when their times of punishment expire, are without means or clothes in which decently to seek an honest subsistence, even if they are disposed.

Lastly. The greatest need of all is a radical change in some cases, of our criminal jurisprudence. The drunken vagrant will not respect the law as it is now too often administered; nor is the daughter of sin and shame very likely to reform, under the influences which are now brought to bear upon her. Our legislation is either absurd or greatly defective. We license the very *causes* that in no small measure create the social evils in our midst, and punish the results that are but the necessary consequences which we thus license into being. We are satisfied that the border line between the virtuous and the vicious is much narrower than is generally supposed, and that we should oftener mingle pity with our condemnation. Published statistics of crime show that over two-thirds of all the arrests "involve a very slight degree of moral turpitude." The property clerk of the New York Police, testifies "that 98½ per cent. of stolen property is voluntarily returned to the owners." We could present an array of facts, that as *causes*, would soften, if they do not excuse the guilt of many offenders."

Hitherto we have omitted to make mention of the first Female Missionary connected with this Mission, in order that, in its proper place, we might both acknowledge her efficient labors and call attention to the first Charitable Institution, which has grown out of the work in which we are engaged.

When the Rev. Mr. Richmond, returning from Oregon, recommenced his visits to Blackwell's Island, he was accompanied by his wife. Her attention was directed, from the first, to the women, who, in great numbers, either as vagrants or for other reasons, found their way to the Island. Among them were many for whom there seemed a hope of better things and better days, if any home were provided in which the most hopeful cases might be invited to take refuge. In the then existing state of affairs, every good word was hopelessly thrown away. Upon the discharge of those women from the Island, homeless and friendless, their former companions in sin, or those daughters of hell who thrive upon their ruin, awaited their arrival upon the opposite shore, and led them at once to haunts of vice. After much thought and counsel and prayer, Mrs. Richmond resolved that at least an attempt should be made to furnish a home, in which those exposed to temptation might take shelter, and those weary of sin might find a rest. The result of the effort of that noble, determined, Christian woman has been the establishment of the Institution known as the "HOUSE OF MERCY," which, from that small beginning, has increased and prospered, until now more than thirty persons find a welcome home within its walls. As we propose in another connection to give some account of that much needed charity, it is neither a need or desire to enlarge upon it now. Our wish is only to show how out of one good work there springs another. As years grow by, and the love of Christ warms in men's hearts, many another needed refuge, or home, will, we believe, in like manner appear as an offshoot of this Mission.

In closing, we commend this work to those upon whom it rests, by labor and gift and prayer to speed it. We have told our tale, not in boasting, but in the humble trust that, under God's blessing, the knowledge of what may be done will stir up pious hearts throughout our land to this undone work of caring for the homeless and friendless. Having been for many years engaged in these labors, it has become our common inquiry upon entering any town or village containing either Jail, or Hospital, or Alms House, "Does any Clergyman visit this In-



stitution?" The almost universal answer has been, "Not regularly; if any is asked for, he always goes." In truth, however, he is seldom asked for, and therefore seldom goes.

Upon visiting, some years since, the Jail of one of our Southern cities, we asked of the Jailer, who had been for half a generation in charge, if the Clergy often visited his prisoners. He answered, that twice an Episcopal Minister had been there; with that exception, he had never before seen any Minister within his gates. Yet, upon the breaking out afterwards of a pestilence, the men and women of that city, with a devotion which spared not their own lives, gave themselves to the care of the sick, thus proving, that no want of Christian love had made them neglectful of the prisoner. As there, so also we believe elsewhere, hearts are ready, but the field every day at hand is overlooked.

If any labors or words of ours shall serve to draw the attention of Clergy and Laity to a work given us by Christ and yet forgotten, then the prayer which goes with labor and word will have been heard, and to those hopeless of blessing will it be given to see the glorious signs of Christ's presence and life. One of the most common and most weighty objections against the Church of Christ in our times, urged alike by infidels and worldlings, is, that the Church, though dignified in tone, and majestic in ritual, is not equal to the exigencies of society, that the paralysis of old age is upon her, and that a New Evangel is needed. Neglectful of her duty as the Church has been, we yet write under the deep conviction that the objection is really groundless, and that she is already beginning to vindicate her high claims by the most persuasive of all arguments, a humble, holy, Christ-like Charity. God speed our words to the hearts of all our Clergy and our Laity. We have been laboring in past years to prove, and we have proved, that we have the Apostolic Ministry and the Apostolic Creeds; let us now use another kind of argument.

We propose, hereafter, to give a sketch of the several Church Charities, such as "Homes," "Hospitals," Missionary Chapels, &c., a large number of which have been successfully commenced in the City within the last few years.

## NOTE.—CORRECTION.

WE have received from one of the Committee appointed by the last General Convention to report to the next General Convention "upon the whole subject of the Hymnody and Metrical Psalmody of the Church," the following Note, which we publish as thus best accomplishing the end for which the Note was written.

---

REV. DR. RICHARDSON, EDITOR, &c.

*My Dear Sir:*

The interesting and sparkling Article in the April *Church Review*, entitled "Hymns from Compilers' Hands," states, on page 49, and proceeds throughout on the supposition, that the gentlemen who proposed the "Hymns for Church and Home" were the Committee appointed by the General Convention in 1859, and that this book is the result of their deliberations in that capacity.

In fact, as you will remember, they were but a self-constituted "Committee;" the original edition of the book was printed before the Convention of 1859, and copies were placed in the hands of the members of the Convention.

The error, which it is easy to explain as to its origin, does not require any public correction on account of the Compilers of the book. Nor may it materially affect the purposes of the Reviewer, whose criticisms were in both cases equally just.

The Committee appointed by the Convention have never had a meeting; whether it would complain of this ascription of responsibility, I cannot say.

But it is still a historical error; and appearing in the pages of such a publication as the Review, might hereafter mislead some one who should be tracing the history of our Hymnology in the Church.

Yours very truly,

---

## EDITORIAL.

THE absolute impossibility of reaching a large number of the Subscribers to the Review, in consequence of the derangement of the Mails, will compel us to postpone the mailing of this Number to them. Even in this case, the Volume will be completed as usual, and the Numbers will be sent as soon as possible.

We are glad to be able to say, that our subscription list, which was never better than now, has scarcely been affected by the civil troubles of the country, though the disturbed state of the public currency has rendered the payment of subscriptions, especially those at a distance, more than usually difficult. We bespeak from those of our subscribers, living where commercial exchanges are still kept up with New York, prompt remittances, by which we may be in a measure relieved from all embarrassment. Our Southern brethren, among whom are many of our ablest contributors, warmest friends, and best supporters, are assured that we look forward with pleasure to the restoration of a speedy and open communication with them.

The Article in this Number, on the "*Essays and Reviews*," though long, will not be thought too long by our readers. Nor are we yet done with the subject. This volume will be examined from another stand-point in the next Review. We are also prepared to state, and to prove, that this German Rationalism has already been imbibed in our own Church to an extent much greater than is generally supposed.

## NOTICES OF BOOKS.

**THE BIBLE AND THE CLASSICS.** By the Rt. Rev. WM. MEADE, D. D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Virginia. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 1861. 8vo. pp. 558.

THERE are few thoughtful Christian readers who have not, at some period of their lives, been startled at facts which meet them in the history and development of the various systems of Heathenism, all over the world, and at their unmistakable resemblance, in some one point or another, to that one great Plan of Redemption, which they regard as alone worthy of their belief and confidence. At one time, Infidelity used this admitted fact as an argument, and with great effect. Of later years, however, the researches of learned men are showing, beyond a peradventure, that these facts in Heathenism are incontestible proofs of a Supernatural Religion, ante-dating all Heathenism, and having their alone solution in "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world." Among the more popular of modern writers who have given their attention to this line of investigation, are Sir Matthew Hale, Warburton, Cudworth, Hardwick, Trench, Rawlinson, &c. Bishop Meade has attempted a summary of this whole argument; and he has, we think, been entirely successful. He has done enough to guard the great multitude of believers against the cavils of the scoffer, and he points to the sources of a more scientific and thorough examination, if any one chooses to pursue it. In stating his plan, the Bishop says: "Who can question the importance of some work, which shall bring within moderate compass a comparative view of the leading principles and facts of the Bible, and of all the false religions of earth, showing that they had the same origin, but how, under the latter, men gradually "turned the truth of God into a lie," and came "to worship the creature more than the Creator," and, at length, were given up of God to all the abominations which abound in the heathen world."

**ANNALS OF THE AMERICAN PULPIT; or, Commemorative Notices of Distinguished American Clergymen of various Denominations, from the early settlement of the Country, to the close of the year 1825; with Historical Introductions.** By WILLIAM B. SPRAGUE, D. D. Volume VII. New York: Carter & Brothers. 1859. 8vo. pp. 848.

The present volume is devoted to biographical sketches of the more distinguished Methodist preachers, of whom the lives of nearly two hundred are given. In intellectual strength, and in solid learning, the preachers of no denomination in our country will suffer in comparison with the Methodists. Indeed, until quite recently, it was quite the fashion among them to decry "book-learning," as it was called. If their zeal was without knowledge, it was not without the appearance of grace, and being seasoned, often-times, with coarse wit, and with a plenty of over-bearing pretentiousness, it carried away the masses of the illiterate, as by storm. Some amusing illustrations of this may be found in the volume before us. And yet, not a few of these preachers were men of great natural shrewdness, and, we doubt not, of sincere piety, and Methodism, in our country, has unquestionably done a

great work. It is, of necessity, changing its policy now, but it is ceasing to be Methodism. With the exception of Coke, Asbury, Summerfield, Olin, Fisk, Jason Lee, and a few other names, there are few, in the record given by Dr. Sprague, who will attract interest outside of that denomination. We notice some remarkable mis-statements, and some equally remarkable omissions. Thus, in the life of Francis Asbury, it is said of John Wesley, that he "was in the full exercise of all the Episcopal powers at home." Nothing is said of Dr. Coke's correspondence with Bishop White, on the "re-ordination" of the Methodist preachers in America, nor of Coke's attempts to be sent out, as an English Bishop, to India. The whole history of Methodism in this country opens up some important practical questions to us as Churchmen; that is, if the Church is to be any thing else than the Church of a Class, and if she is to be Catholic, in reality, as well as in name.

GLEANINGS. By Mrs. L. H. SIGOURNEY. Hartford: Brown & Gross. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1860. 8vo. pp. 264.

If these are "Gleanings," they are the gleanings of a rich and plentiful harvest, and, we suspect, that, like as with the reapers of Boaz, some of the handfuls have purposely been let fall. We have long desired and designed to examine with care the writings of Mrs. Sigourney, one of our truest and purest of poets. The high moral tone, the keen sensibility to the Beautiful and the True, the deep Christian devotion, which looks instinctively through Nature and Providence, up to Him who rules immediately in both, and the easy, flowing verse, these charming characteristics of Mrs. Sigourney's poetry, will always make her a favorite with the very best class of readers. It is a depraved public taste, and just now a growing one, which mistakes irreverence and doctrinal impiety for Genius; and two, at least, of our most fashionable writers are floating upon the top-most wave of just such a popularity. One of them has lately received his just deserts at the hands of an English critic, and the other will soon die a natural death.

One of the most beautiful things in this volume is, the Lines on that touching scene in the last General Convention, when the *Gloria in Excelsis* went up to God, from all hearts and all voices, in prayer and praise, at the appointment of two new Missionary Apostles to the moral wastes of our own land.

"The glorious anthem ceas'd—yet still they stood,  
Wrapped in adoring silence."

We are half disposed to make a note of that "Stuffed Owl" from "Plymouth Rock," yet we fear the fair poetess would not forgive us, and it is, perhaps, just as well, that the solemn cadences of the "koko-koho" should die away without an echo from us. There is something in the volume for almost every mood.

CHAMBERS' ENCYCLOPEDIA: A Dictionary of Universal Knowledge for the People, on the Basis of the Latest Edition of the German Conversations Lexicon. Illustrated by Wood Engravings and Maps. Vol. I. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. Edinburgh: W. & R. Chambers. 1860. 8vo. pp. 824.

Although the title to this work is an old one, with which every body is familiar, the work before us is, essentially, a new one, and, for many reasons, deserves special attention. Ephraim Chambers' great work, his Scientific Dictionary, a folio in two volumes, published in London, in 1728, was the first attempt made to arrange in alphabetical order the several branches of knowledge; a plan which has since been so generally adopted, and so thoroughly carried out. Messrs. Wil-

liam and Robert Chambers, the authors of the work before us, are men of established literary and scientific reputation, abundantly competent to execute, thoroughly, the task which they have undertaken. Their first determination was, to translate the celebrated German work, *The Conversations-Lexikon*, first published at Leipsic, in six volumes, (1796-1810,) and which has passed through ten successive editions, the last in sixteen volumes. They soon, however, abandoned this idea, and determined to bring out a substantially new work, making the last edition of the *Conversations-Lexikon* the basis of their work, but adding to it from all the sources within their reach. The first volume (A. to Bel.) is precisely what its title indicates, *A Dictionary of Universal Knowledge for the People*. For all ordinary purposes, it answers the end of an Encyclopedia. All important terms are given, and the really necessary information stated, thoroughly and compactly, with the aids as above mentioned. There are also numerous illustrative Maps and Engravings, and, at the conclusion of the work, a copious General Index will be given. There is one feature of this work which deserves special notice. While it is thoroughly learned, there is in it the entire absence of that rationalistic infidel temper, which pervades so many of our modern Cyclopedias, and which alone should bar them from general circulation. The same amount of scientific information cannot be found elsewhere within the same compass.

THE NEW AMERICAN CYCLOPEDIA. A Popular Dictionary of General Knowledge. Edited by GEORGE RIPLEY and CHARLES A. DANA. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Vol. XII. 8vo. 1861. pp. 788.

This Cyclopaedia has solid merits, and has already obtained a large circulation. So far as it has a character of its own, we are obliged to say, that the work is evidently compiled under the influences, we will not say in the interests, of the modern rationalistic philosophy; if that can be called philosophy, which is, rather, a habit of thinking than a system, and which evinces more knowledge than wisdom, and is rather pretentious than modest and deeply learned. We are surprised at the six columns and more of eulogistic obituary bestowed upon Thomas Paine; a man who lived like a brute, and died in the agony of remorse. The article on the terms "Objective and Subjective," though carefully written, takes no cognizance of one of the most important distinctions between them, and one which Coleridge has rendered too familiar to be thus passed by.

THE HISTORY OF ENGLAND, from the Accession of James II. By THOMAS BABINGTON MACAULAY. With an original Portrait of the Author. In Five Volumes. Vol. V. Edited by his Sister, LADY TREVELYAN; with a complete Index to the entire work. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1861. 12 mo. pp. 293.

We have here all of the continuation of Macaulay's "History of England," which the author had transcribed and revised. It is brought down to the death of William III. We know of no writer so popular, and at the same time so little likely to hold, permanently, the public confidence. Tories and Quakers, Dissenters and Churchmen, all will have an account to settle with the facts of his History, when his grandiloquent and well rounded periods come to be coolly dissected. A few years hence, nobody will quote him as authority, simply because nobody will claim that he is candid and impartial. Macaulay was a splendid reviewer, and as a word-painter, many of his sketches are masterly.

THE WORKS OF FRANCIS BACON, Baron of Verulam, Viscount St. Albans, and Lord High Chancellor of England. Collected and Edited by JAMES SPEDDING, M. A., ROBERT LESLIE ELLIS, M. A., and DOUGLAS DENON HEATH. Vol. XV., being Vol. V. of the Literary and Professional Works. Boston: Brown & Taggard. 12mo., 1861. pp. 449.

The present volume is a continuation of the Professional Works of Lord Bacon, and contains several of his most important Arguments of Law. As we have before said, the work is elegantly printed.

THE WITS AND THE BEAUX OF SOCIETY; By GRACE and PHILIP WHARTON. Authors of "The Queens of Society." With sixteen illustrations, from Drawings by H. K. Browne and James Godwin, engraved by the Brothers Dalziel. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1861. 12mo. pp. 481.

One of the pleasantest reflections in reading this book is, that the book itself is a curiosity,—and that there is an elevation of moral sentiment, especially in England at the present day, before which these "Wits and Beaux of Society," of the age of the Restoration and the Hanoverian rule, would have slunk in conscious disgrace. There may be more hypocrisy and more prudery, but there is more virtue and more decency. The authors of the book have stirred up this old cess-pool with evident zest, and their style is stilted; still, there is gossip and scandal enough to make the work readable to those who are fond of such fare. The following are the characters drawn: George Villiers, Second Duke of Buckingham; De Grammont, Saint Evremont and Rochester; Beau Fielding; Of Certain Clubs and Club Wits under Anne; William Congreve; Beau Nash and the Bath Set; Philip, Duke of Wharton; Lord Hervey and the Twickenham Set; Philip Dormer Stanhope, Lord Chesterfield; The Abbe Scarron; La Rochefoucault and Saint Simon; Horace Walpole and Strawberry Hill; George Selwyn and Gilly Williams; Richard Brinsley Sheridan and the Prince's Set; Theodore Edward Hook and the Literary Set; Sidney Smith and the Holland House Set; George Eubb Dodington, Lord Melcombe.

THE PRESBYTERIAN'S HAND-BOOK OF THE CHURCH. For the use of Members, Deacons, Elders, and Ministers. By JOEL PARKER, D. D., and Rev. T. RALSTON SMITH. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1861. 18mo. pp. 250.

As this Hand-Book is issued upon the responsibility only of the gentlemen whose names are mentioned, we have little to say of it. How far it is, or is not, in harmony with the teaching of the Presbyterian Standards, in respect to such things as the Church, the Ministry, the Sacraments,—the leading Doctrines of that denomination, therefore,—it much better becomes them, than us, to examine. The book, however, is significant, in a good many ways. Its toning down of the strong Calvinism of Presbyterian doctrine; its ignoring the strong Churchly and Sacramental teachings of their established Offices by mutilated quotations; its curious preparation of Liturgies for private and public devotions; and its side-way hits at Episcopacy—all this looks as if the book had been gotten up to meet an emergency. Among the strange statements in the book is this: "The parity of Christian Ministers is there [in the New Testament] plainly asserted. Bishops and elders, or presbyters, are acknowledged by all scholars to be the same," &c. And he then quotes Bishop H. U. Onderdonk as sustaining this position! Does Dr. Parker wish it to be believed, that he has quoted Bishop Onderdonk fairly? Or, is he sure that he understands the Scriptural argument on this subject as to the use of terms or



words? St. Paul, for example, called himself a *diaconos*; and what then? Was there no such thing in the Primitive Church as an Order of Deacons? And if there was such an Order, was St. Paul *only* a Deacon? The book, however, is a good sign. We only regret that there is so much of denominational prejudice (and there is too much cause for it,) as to prevent his seeing, that in the Protestant Episcopal Church, almost every thing which he is looking for may be found, already provided to his hand.

THE SHADOWY LAND, AND OTHER POEMS, (Including the Guests of Brazil.) By REV. GURDON HUNTINGTON, A. M. New York: James Miller. 1861. 8vo. pp. 508.

It is a somewhat hazardous experiment to print so large a volume of poetry as this, even though it were full, to running over, of the purest, sweetest song. The most elaborate Poem in the collection, and that, to which the author has evidently given most thought, is the first; "THE SHADOWY LAND," filling one hundred and sixty pages. It is a grand theme, rich in resources of the imagination, allowing the widest scope to fancy, and fruitful and suggestive to one who would make the power of verse auxiliary to the teaching of Religion. That the Natural World, in all its beauty and its deformity, is a great Sacrament, a type of the world unseen, a symbol of things spiritual and yet real; this seems to have been the great thought, filling the mind of the writer. He has confined himself less closely to the inspired historical Narrative, than Milton, and is even less didactic, in his doctrinal teaching, than Mr. Lord, whose "CHRIST IN HADES," was reviewed in a previous volume of this Review. We can hardly call it a successful poem, and yet to fail on such a theme is no reason for speaking lightly of his claims as a poet. With much poetic beauty of conception and of expression, his verse is too often labored, rough and uneven, his fancy is not always sufficiently chastened, and his thoughts are sometimes obscurely expressed. The best pieces in the volume are those simple Odes which seem to have oozed out from the author's pen unbidden, where the true poetic fire always reveals itself, if it really exists.

SILAS MARNER, THE WEAVER OF RAVELOE. By the Author of "Adam Bede." New York: Harper & Brothers. 1861. 12mo. pp. 265.

Whatever the author of "Adam Bede" may write, the public will be disposed to read; but she may well bear in mind, that even the reputation of that very clever work may be tasked too heavily, if it is to drag along such careless, slipshod, and hastily-written stories as "Silas Marner." It was written, originally, we believe, for Harper's Magazine. There is enough in the characters, and plot, and plan of the story, to have made a very good thing, that is, if the writer is equal to the work of thoroughly elaborating it, as we dare say she is. The type of life which she here represents, is taken from the lower walks of English Society, and while there are vigorous touches and life-like sketches, and masterly groupings, they only show what the writer could have done, if she had really tried.

HARPERS' GREEK AND LATIN CLASSICS.—

EURIPIDES ex recensione Frederici A. Paley. Vols II. and III.

THUCYDIDES. Recensuit Joannes Gulielmus Donaldson, S. T. P. Vols I. and II.

PUBLI VERGILI MARONIS OPERA, ex recensione J. Conington, A. M.

The Messrs. Harpers' edition of the Cambridge Greek and Latin Texts are fac-  
VOL. XIV. NO. II.

similes of the English volumes, and are superior in paper, type, and convenience, to the famous Leipsic edition, which used to be a *sine-qua-non* to so many of our scholars.

THE ORDEAL OF FREE LABOR IN THE WEST INDIES. By WM. G. SEWELL. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1861. 12mo. pp. 325.

Whether Slavery in the abstract, or Slavery in the concrete, is right, or whether it is wrong, is one question, and a question which Mr. Sewell, in this volume, does not pretend to touch. The question which he raises is, whether it "pays?" Or, rather, he undertakes to prove, that the general impression of the disastrous results, industrially and commercially, of British Emancipation in the West India Islands, is wholly wrong; and the experiment of Free Labor, in the West India Islands, is, on the whole, a successful one. To be sure, he is compelled to admit, that "a comparison of Jamaica exports in 1805, her year of greatest prosperity, with her exports in 1859, must appear odious to her inhabitants." "In the former year, the island exported over 150,000 hogsheads of sugar, and in the latter year, she exported 28,000 hogsheads. The exports of rum and coffee exhibit the same proportionate decrease." He is forced to say, also, that "mortality among children, from want of proper attention, is frightful."

"The people of Jamaica are not cared for; they perish, miserably, in country districts, for want of medical aid; they are not instructed; they have no opportunities to improve themselves in agriculture or mechanics; every effort is made to check a spirit of independence, which, in the African, is counted a heinous crime, but, in all other people, is regarded as a lofty virtue, and the germ of national courage, enterprise and progress." And he manages to get along with these ugly facts, in the best way he can.

We had proposed to place before our readers a thorough examination of this volume, from the pen of an English gentleman, who has resided many years in Jamaica, and who has no prejudices or prepossessions to disqualify him from giving an impartial judgment upon the subject. But the present is no time to discuss such a question. The work is one-sided and superficial, and is of small account, whether the question be regarded as one of Christian philosophy or political economy.

SHORT FAMILY PRAYERS for Every Morning and Evening of the Week, and for Particular Occasions. By JONATHAN M. WAINWRIGHT, D. D. pp. 54.

AN ORDER OF FAMILY PRAYER for Every Day in the Week, and for the Commemoration of the Holy Days and Seasons of the Church. Selected and Arranged from the Bible, the Liturgy, and various Books of Devotion. By the Rev. J. M. WAINWRIGHT, D. D., Assistant Minister of Trinity Church, New York. Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co. pp. 164.

These are two distinct manuals of Family Devotions. The former is composed of short prayers for every morning and evening in the week, together with petitions to be used on special occasions. "The prayers," as we are informed in the preface, "are not, strictly, original, nor yet are they a mere selection, or a compilation, but a combination of all these, in the use of the Bible, the Liturgy, and various devotional writers."

REV. DR. MUHLENBERG'S SERMON at the re-opening of the "Church of Augustus," Montgomery Co., Penn. New York: Robert Craighead. 1861. 8vo. pp. 46.

Dr. Muhlenberg's Sermon would afford an appropriate opportunity to open up the

whole question, which was involved in what is known as the "Memorial Movement." It was preached, by invitation, at the re-opening of a Lutheran house of worship, in which his great-grand-father was pastor, in 1743; and which, mainly by the liberality of Dr. Muhlenberg, has been saved from going to utter decay and ruin. The Sermon, besides its local historical features, is devoted, mainly, to an exposition of the Unity in Faith between the Lutheran Communion and our own; and the Doctor expresses, freely and fully, his desire for a unity of communion and fellowship, between two bodies which have so much in common. In one respect, Dr. Muhlenberg represents a certain idea or truth more prominently than any other man in our Ministry. It is a truth, fundamental in its character, and is far more distinctly enunciated in the Augsburg Confession and Symbols, than in our XXXIX Articles, viz; The Life of Christ as the only true Life of the individual Christian, and of the Church. But, he will pardon us for saying, and it is really the main point where we differ from one, whose loving, earnest heart and life we hold in honor, that, in our judgment, the great want of our age and time is, not a concealment, but a clearer presentation, a more manifest exhibition of those Positive Institutions, which the LORD JESUS, through the HOLY GHOST, and by the Apostles, established, to be perpetuated to the end of time. As to the Doctor's theory of the "Prophetic Office," or of a Ministry of the Word, in distinction from the Ministry of the Sacraments, what we have already said indicates what we would say, more freely, if we had room. If we have read Eusebius and Bingham correctly, the most that can well be made of Origen is, that he belonged to the order of Catechists, though the term is not to be understood in its modern acceptation. We fully agree with the Doctor, that we have got to introduce a good deal more of Primitive practice into the Church, before we shall ever come back to primitive efficiency and power. We want Deacons who are Deacons indeed, and Deaconesses; we want Catechists, and Lay-helpers, men and women. We want to get rid, most of all, of the dead weight of a mere perfunctory respectability. And yet, and for this very reason, we are not to undervalue Ordinances and Institutions, which have both the authority, and the promised blessing of the HOLY GHOST; nor can we hope that the Church of our profession and our love, will ever receive the allegiance of Romanists, on the one hand, and the Methodists, &c., &c., &c., on the other, if we fail to present her, distinctly, in all her divine features.

REV. DR. RANDALL'S Sermon, before the Board of Missions, at New Haven, Oct. 10, 1860. "Missions—The Church Work: Its Mode and Measure." Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1861. 18mo. pp. 52.

That it is the duty of the Church, *as such*, and according to the measure of its ability, to do Missionary Work, is the position which Dr. Randall takes and sustains. This is so nearly an axiom, that it would scarcely seem even to admit of argument. The only objection which we have ever heard, either against the position itself or against Dr. Randall's statement of it, is, that it might seem to conflict with that free and voluntary individuality of choice, which is every Churchman's birthright, and which is so requisite to vigorous, healthful Missionary life and activity. To this, as it seems to us, there are two, and only two things to be said. In the first place, the duty of the Church involves, of necessity, the corresponding duties of the individual members who compose that Church; and then there arises the simple and important question, whether, as a matter of fact, the Church, in her

modes of action, has made such provision for individuality of choice, as is consistent with her own solemn responsibility to the Great Head of the Church. To this question, after what has transpired, there can be but one answer. We are not here discussing, at all, the question, "What is the Church?" nor whether ours is, or is not, a true Branch of that Church. We are simply announcing a principle of loyalty, which belongs to any organization, which claims to be the Church of Christ, and without which, that organization cannot work, lovingly and effectively.

The Notes to Dr. Randall's Sermon help to explain his meaning, and are valuable.

**TRUMPS. A Novel.** By GEORGE WILLIAM CURTIS. Author of "Nile Notes of a Howadji," &c. Illustrated by Augustus Hoppin. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1861. 12mo. pp. 502.

Mr. Curtis is one of the popular writers of the day, in whom it is not difficult to detect more than an unbelief and indifference as to the great Doctrines and Institutions of the Gospel. It is something, that such men seem to feel compelled to gild over their noxious doses, in order to make them acceptable to the public. Both in style and sentiment, there is a degree of coarseness and indelicacy, which we were not prepared for, in an author of so much reputation.

**CATECHISM ON THE CHURCH.** By Mrs. D. C. WESTON; Author of "Calvary Catechism." Second Edition. New York: Gen. Prot. Ep. S. Sch. Union and Church Book Society.

Mrs. Weston, in her admirable "Calvary Catechism," has made the little ones of the Church her lasting debtors, and in the "Catechism on the Church," has done equal service for pupils more advanced. The questions and answers are so plainly laid down, that a child may read them, while information is imparted concerning the Church, which every adult should know. It is an invaluable book for the Sunday School, and advanced classes, and is, also, a very convenient volume to aid a Pastor in preparing classes for adult Baptism and Confirmation. The instructions on all points are clear and conclusive, and, that much neglected topic of Infant Baptism is so presented as to leave no doubt concerning its obligation and value. This book, although a small volume, is so thorough a treatise, that, if its lessons are carefully learned, it will make well-informed, intelligent Churchmen. It gives no uncertain sound concerning the distinctive teachings of the Church, and yet, every point is so well established by an array of authorities and proof texts, as to show a conscientious regard to truth. In recommending this little book to Pastors and teachers, we feel, that all who wish for an aid in giving Church instruction in the Parish or the school, will value, highly, this interesting and instructive Catechism by Mrs. Weston.

**THE CHURCHMAN'S CALENDAR,** for the year of our Blessed Lord Christ, 1861. Designed to exhibit an actual View of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church in all the World. No. 1.. This Calendar is the successor of Swords' Pocket Almanac, and follows the Forty-fourth Number of that series. By the Rev. A. CLEVELAND COXE, D. D. New York: Church Book Society. 1861. 18mo. pp. 72.

The plan of the Editor, Dr. Coxe, is admirable. It is to give, in popular form, and at a trifling cost, as far as possible, an annual view of the Catholic and Apostolic Church in all the world, with its chief Bishops and prominent institutions.

He says, that "in his arrangement of the existing Churches of Christendom, he has followed no guide but the ancient Catholic Law." We have, therefore, a statistical and tabular account of, I. The Oriental Churches; II. The Latin Churches; III. The Anglican Churches; IV. Abnormal Churches; V. The Tridentine Churches. There are, also, lists of the Bishops of the English, Irish, Scottish, Anglican, Colonial, Swedish and American Churches, with the dates of their consecration. There are, also, scattered throughout this little volume, scraps of history, pertinent and valuable. Hereafter, tabular views of the various Christian Sects will be given. In order to keep up the series permanently, this Calendar should also, we think, include a full Clerical list of our own Church, and such Diocesan Intelligence as the great mass of our own Clergyman and Laymen need to have, and will have before them; that the work should be issued promptly; and then published so cheaply, that it can be scattered almost gratuitously. In other words, make the "Churchman's Calendar" a necessity, and then issue it in as cheap a form as possible.

FIRST ANNUAL REPORT of the American Printing House for the Blind. Published by order of the Mississippi Board, Louisville, Ky. 1860. 8vo. pp. 48.

The enterprise brought before us in this Report is a new and most important one. While nearly all of the States provide for the instruction of their Blind, no especial provision has ever been made for printing books, either for school purposes or general improvement. All printing, thus far, has been done by private means, or by the Institutions themselves; and it is entirely insufficient in quantity and variety. For some time past, Mr. D. SHERROD, formerly a pupil of the Mississippi Institution for the Blind, has been, and is still, engaged in the endeavor to establish a Publishing House, through the instrumentality of which it is proposed, permanently and adequately, to supply the Blind with books. The enterprise is solely of his own conception and execution; and it is gratifying to state that he has met with encouraging success. Mississippi, which has taken the lead in this matter, has granted a Charter of Incorporation, and so also has Kentucky. Mississippi and Tennessee and Louisiana have each given \$2000 to the object, and pledged \$10 annually for each white blind person in those States. In all, \$25,000 has already been raised, and the Printing House is to go into operation at once in Kentucky, at Louisville. By Charter, every school for the Blind, located in a State whose Legislature or citizens contribute to the funds of the American Printing House, shall, in proportion to the funds contributed, be entitled to copies of every book published by said House, to be distributed gratuitously to such blind persons as are unable to purchase them. The lists of the Boards of Trustees comprise names of the highest reputation, and entire confidence may be placed in them for the wise disposal of funds. The address of Mr. D. Sherwood is at Louisville, Ky.

REV. DR. W. W. LORD'S SERMON in Christ Church, Vicksburg, Miss., Apr. 21, 1861:  
"Our True Government: and our obligation to maintain it."

REV. DR. W. W. LORD'S SERMON in Christ Church, Vicksburg, Miss., Feb. 17, 1861:  
"The Clergy and the Civil Power; and the moral proofs of a true Government."

REV. J. H. PADDOCK'S SERMON in Christ Church, Detroit, May 13, 1861, before the Detroit Light Guard. "Our Cause, Our Confidence, and our Consequent Duty."

REV. DR. CHARLES MASON'S SERMON, in Grace Church, Boston, on the National Fast Day, Jan 4, 1861.

REV. H. W. BELLOWS' SERMON, in All Souls' Church, New York, Apr. 21, 1861.  
"The State and the Nation—Sacred to Christian Citizens."

GENERAL R. K. CALL'S (of Florida) LETTER to John S. Littell, of Germantown, Penn. "Union—Slavery—Secession."

THE NECESSITIES AND WISDOM OF 1861. A Supplement to the Sixth Edition of  
"Slavery and the Remedy." By Samuel Nott: Boston: 1861.

Of the above pamphlets and Sermons called forth by the present Civil War, the two last, General Call's Letter, and Mr. Nott's Supplement, enter directly into the real merits of the whole question; and both of these contain statements of important facts which it is impossible to ignore, and which will have to be considered and provided for, before our domestic difficulties can be settled. Millions on millions of money and rivers of blood must be the price of the present exasperation and bitter prejudice, North and South, and then there will come cool reflection and sober deliberation, and there will be heard, we believe, the voice of true patriotism and Christian philanthropy.

SECOND REPORT of the "House of Mercy." New York, March 1, 1861.

STRICTURES on the Two Letters of Provost Whitaker in answer to charges brought by the Lord Bishop of Huron against the teaching of Trinity College. By a Presbyterian. London, Canada West. 1861. 8vo. pp. 96.

Having, in our April No., given a full account of the origin and nature of the charges brought by the Bishop of Huron against Trinity College, it seems unnecessary to notice at length the defense of the Bishop by a Presbyterian, in the pamphlet before us. The whole question is a simple one. It is whether the Standards of the Church of England are to be received in a Scriptural, Primitive and Catholic interpretation, or as frittered and explained away by modern Protestantism. That the English Reformers, in the great work to which they were called, did take for their guide, the old rule, the "*Semper, ubique, ab omnibus*," is as certain as any fact of history. And yet it is easy enough to torture individual expressions of some of those Reformers into the support of almost anything. But such attempts are neither fair nor honest. We are sorry to see some of the statements of this pamphlet; they indicate a reading thoroughly one-sided and a bad temper.

NINTH ANNUAL REPORT of the Missionary Society of St. Paul's Church, New Haven, Conn. 1861.

The report thus states the results of the missionary labors of this parish during the last nine years. "This Society, through the blessing of God upon its efforts, has gathered two large Sunday Schools, two flourishing Congregations, and erected two Church edifices. Through the labors of its Missionaries, seventy-five adults, and four hundred and fifty one children, have received the Sacrament of Baptism; and one hundred and eighty-five persons have been admitted to the Communion of our Church, through the rite of Confirmation. And finally, this Society, as the almoner of your charities, has disbursed for Church extension, at home and abroad, more than \$21,000."

# ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

## SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

### ORDINATIONS.

#### DEACONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Banks, David F.	Williams,	May 22, 1861,	Holy Trinity, Middletown, Ct.
Barker, T. B.	Potter, A.	Apr. 13, "	St. Michael's, Germantown, Pa.
Bird, G. C.	Johns,	May 7, "	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Bishop,	Odenheimer,	May 27, "	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
Blake, John Falkner,	Potter, H.	May 23, "	Epiphany, New York City.
Burgess, H. B.	Kemper,	June 3, "	Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
Cummins, Alex. G.	Williams,	Apr. 10, "	St. James', New London, Ct.
Dafter, William,	Kemper,	June 3, "	Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
De Puy, Ephraim,	Potter, H.	May 23, "	Epiphany, New York City.
Dobbs, Alexander,	Polk,	Jan. 27, "	Trinity, New Orleans, La.
Eddy, Thomas Hooker,	Lee, H. W.	Apr. 28, "	St. Luke's, Davenport, Iowa.
Elliott, John H.	Davis,	Jan. 27, "	Grace, Camden, S. C.
Fuller, Simon G.	Williams,	May 22, "	Holy Trinity, Middletown, Ct.
Grammer,	Meade,	May 19, "	St. Paul's, Richmond, Va.
Gushee, Edward M.	Clark,	May 22, "	Holy Trinity, Middletown, Ct.
Harria, William R.	Williams,	May 22, "	Holy Trinity, Middletown, Ct.
Jackson, Lewis H.	Whittingham,	Oct. 21, 1860,	St. Mark's, Perryville, Md.
Jones, Henry L.	Potter, H.	May 23, 1861,	Epiphany, New York City.
Johnson, Edwin E.	Williams,	May 22, "	Holy Trinity, Middletown, Ct.
Kinney, Henry C.	Potter, H.	May 29, "	St. George's, New York City.
Lewis, Albert C.	Kemper,	June 3, "	Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
Lewis, Samuel Taylor,	Odenheimer,	May 27, "	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
Maxwell, Samuel, Jr.,	Potter, H.	May 23, "	Epiphany, New York City.
Mills, Laurence H.	Potter, H.	May 23, "	Epiphany, New York City.
Monges, Henry B.	Gregg,	Apr. 14, "	St. David's, Austin, Texas.
Mortimer, G. D. C.	Johns,	May 7, "	Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Niles, Wm. W.	Williams,	May 22, "	Holy Trinity, Middletown, Ct.
Reed, J. B. T.	Meade,	Mar. 24, "	Grace, Berryville, Va.
Reilly, W. M.	Kemper,	June 3, "	Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
Ringgold, Samuel,	Smith,	Mar. 30, "	Grace, Louisville, Ky.
Rodefer,	Meade,	May 19, "	St. Paul's, Richmond, Va.
Rowe, W. S.	Upfold,	June 3, "	Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
Seymour, Storrs O.	Williams,	May 22, "	Holy Trinity, Middletown, Ct.
Shand, Alexander,	McCoskry,	Mar. 12, "	St. James', Dexter, La.
Smith, John Eaton,	Williams,	May 22, "	Holy Trinity, Middletown, Ct.



<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Southwell, Geo. Webb,	DeLancey,	June 2,	" St. Peter's, Auburn, W. N. Y.
Steele, A. F.	Johns,	May 7,	" Chapel, Alexandria, Va.
Thomas, Elisha S.	Clark,	May 17,	" St. Paul's, Wickford, R. I.
Tschiffely, L. P.	Upfold,	June 3,	" Chapel, Delafield, Wis.
Tyng, Stephen H., Jr.,	Potter, H.	May 9,	" St. George's, New York City.
Wells, A. E.	Kemper,	June 3,	" Chapel, Delafield, Wis.

## PRIESTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Rev. Abbott, Benj. H.	Potter, H.	April 2, 1861,	Holy Communion, N. Y. City
" Bachman, G. O.	McCoskry,	Mar. 12,	" St. James', Dexter, Mich.
" Clarke, H. M. L.	Odenheimer,	May 27,	" St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
" Fowler, Morelle,	Williams,	Apr. 10,	" St. James', New London, Ct.
" Gholson, J. G.	Polk,	Feb. 24,	" St. Luke's, New Orleans, La.
" Goodhue, J. E.	Williams,	May 31,	" St. Paul's, Brookfield, Ct.
" Green, William,	Johns,	Mar. 30,	" St. George's, Fredericksb'g, Va.
" Gregg, Frank M. Smith,		Apr. 24,	" Ascension, Mt. Sterling, Ky.
" Hansborough, J. S. Johns,		Mar. 22,	" St. Paul's, Petersburg, Va.
" Heald, J. E.	Williams,	May 31,	" St. Paul's, Brookfield, Ct.
" Homans, Jas. E.	Potter, H.	April 2,	" Holy Communion, N. Y. City.
" Hyland, Thos. A. Scott,		April 7,	" ———, Eugene City, Oregon.
" Kellogg, D. O., Jr., Williams,		May 31,	" St. Paul's, Brookfield, Ct.
" Littell, T. Gardiner,	Potter, A.	Apr. 13,	" St. Michael's, Germantown, Pa.
" Saul, James,	Meade,	May 19,	" St. Paul's, Richmond, Va.
" Vaughan, M. H.	Atkinson,	Apr. 14,	" Christ, Elizabeth City, N. C.
" Walshe, A. C.	McCoskry,	May 5,	" St. Paul's, Detroit, Mich.
" Williams, Geo. T. Johns,		Mar. 22,	" St. Paul's, Petersburg, Va.
" Witherspoon, O.	DeLancey,	April 7,	" St. John's, Buffalo, W. N. Y.

## CONSECRATIONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Advent,	Kip,	Feb'y 24, 1861,	San Francisco, Cal.
Epiphany,	Polk,	March 31,	" Opelousas, La.
Memorial,	Potter, H.	April 4,	" New York City.
Redemption,	Potter, H.	March 24,	" New York City.
St. George's,	Scott,	Dec. 30, 1860,	Roseburg, Oregon.
St. Paul's,	Potter, A.	May 16, 1861,	Cheltenham, Penn.
St. Peter's,	Atkinson,	April 11,	" Gates Co., N. C.
St. Peter's,	Whitehouse,	April 23,	" Chesterfield, Ill.
Trinity,	Polk,	April 7,	" Cheneyville, La.
Trinity,	Odenheimer,	May 19,	" Roundabout, N. J.
Trinity,	Williams,	May 28,	" Hartford, Conn.

## OBITUARY.

The RIGHT REV. BENJAMIN TREDWELL ONDERDONK, D. D., LL. D., Bishop of the Diocese of New York, died in New York City, on Tuesday, April 30, 1861, aged 70 years. He was born in New York City, July, 1791. In 1806, at the age of 16,

he entered Columbia College, where he graduated in 1810. In 1812, he was ordained Deacon by Bishop Hobart, in New York City, and Priest by the same Prelate, in Newark, N. J. In 1814, while Deacon, he was elected Assistant Minister of Trinity Church, New York; at the Diocesan Convention, in October, 1830, he was elected Bishop of the Diocese of New York, and was consecrated in St. John's Chapel, Nov. 26, 1830, by the Rt. Rev. Bishops White, Brownell, and H. U. Onderdonk. In 1844, the Right Rev. Bishops Meade, Otey, and Elliott, presented him before the Court of Bishops for trial, on charges of "immorality and impurity;" and he was tried by an Ecclesiastical Court, in New York City, which remained in session from Dec. 10, 1844, until Jan. 3, 1845, when he was suspended "from the office of a Bishop in the Church of God, and from the functions of the Sacred Ministry." On the first scrutiny, *eight* Bishops voted for deposition, *three* for suspension, and *six* for admonition. On the third and last scrutiny, *eight* voted for deposition, and *nine* for suspension. At the Diocesan Convention of New York, in 1859, by a vote of 147 to 19 of the Clergy, and 75 to 46 of the Laity, a vote embracing all shades of ecclesiastical and doctrinal opinion, a Resolution was passed, requesting the House of Bishops to terminate the suspension of Bishop Onderdonk, and restore him, with certain restrictions, to the exercise of his Ministerial functions. The House of Bishops, by a vote which was never published, refused to grant the request. Since his suspension, Bishop Onderdonk has lived in great retirement, rarely leaving the house, except to attend upon the Daily Service of the Church. His last words were those of charity for those who had been most active in his degradation. He was buried from Trinity Church, New York, on Tuesday, May 7, at 3 o'clock, P. M. The Rt. Rev. Bishops POTTER, of New York, DELANCEY, of Western New York, ODENHEIMER, of New Jersey, and SOUTHGATE, of New York City, were present, and great numbers of the Clergy, some of them from distant Dioceses. The pall-bearers were as follows: Rev. Dr. Berrian, Rev. Dr. Creighton, Rev. Dr. Brown, Rev. Dr. Cutler, Rev. Dr. Price, Rev. Mr. Gallaudet, Rt. Rev. Bishop Southgate, Rev. Mr. Mallaby, Rev. Dr. Seabury, Rev. W. L. Johnson, Rev. J. J. Tucker, Rev. Mr. Draper. The opening Sentences were read by Bishop DELANCEY.

After the reading of the Lesson by Rev. Dr. HIGBEE, Rev. Dr. VINTON, Rector of Trinity Church, read the resolutions, which had been adopted by the Standing Committee of the Diocese. Dr. VINTON also read resolutions which had been adopted by members of the Diocese, Clergy and Laity, assembled at Trinity Church on Monday; also the resolutions of the Faculty of the Theological Seminary. Dr. VINTON also alluded to resolutions, that had been passed by the students of the Theological Seminary.

The sermon was preached by Rev. Dr. SEABURY, who took for his text John v. 35. "He was a burning and a shining light: and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light."

Dr. SEABURY gave an account of the administration of the communion to Bishop ONDERDONK, just previous to his death. The whole tenor of the narrative was to show that (as Dr. VINTON had announced) the Bishop died "full of penitence for all the errors which he had committed, but still saying, '*With regard to those offences of which I have been accused, and for which I have been condemned, my conscience still acquits me as in the sight of God.*'"

The REV. JOEL CLAPP, D. D., died at Claremont, N. H., Feb. 24, 1861, aged 68 years. He was born in Montgomery, in the northern part of Vermont, Sept. 4, 1793. His father, Capt. Joshua Clapp, was one of two brothers, both respectable officers, who served through the war of the revolution, and who resembled each other so perfectly that they could be distinguished only by their dress. He removed from Worcester Co., Mass., to Vermont and settled in Montgomery; and for two years his family was the only one in town. The subject of this sketch was the first person born in that town. He entered the University of Vermont, at Burlington, in 1810; but the sudden death of his father in the fall of 1811, compelled him to leave the University and discontinue his Academical studies. After a few years spent in the settlement of his father's estate, he turned his attention to the study of law, and was admitted to its practice; but, not finding the profession congenial to his tastes, he relinquished the practice and entered upon a course of Theological study. In 1818, Oct. 2d, he was ordained a Deacon in the Protestant Episcopal Church, at Greenfield, Mass., by the Rt. Rev. Alexander V. Griswold, to whose jurisdiction the Diocese of Vermont then belonged. He was ordained as Priest, at Windsor, also by Bishop Griswold, Sept. 17, 1819. Soon after his ordination, he organized a Parish in his native town: and the same year he organized another in Berkshire and another in Shelburne. He was instituted Rector of Trinity Church, Shelburne, Oct. 27, 1819. The Convention of 1820 was held in Shelburne; and his name appears in the Journal, as Assistant Secretary, and Rector of Trinity Church. The energy with which he devoted himself to his ministry, during the eight years of his residence in Shelburne, may be inferred from the amount of Missionary service which he performed. During that whole period he had the Pastoral charge of the Churches already named, together with that of the Church at Bethel, to which, in 1826, he added the care of the Church in Woodstock. The extremes of this missionary field were 150 miles apart; and to reach one of them he was obliged to cross the Green Mountain range. In 1828, he resigned his charge in Shelburne and removed to Bethel, officiating alternately between that Parish and Woodstock. In 1832, he accepted a call to Gardiner, Maine, where he remained eight years; and during that period he was a delegate from that Diocese to the General Convention. In 1840 he resumed the Rectorship of the church in Woodstock; and, on the death of the Rev. Mr. Putman, in 1848, he accepted a call to Bellows Falls. After a faithful service of ten years in that Parish, he, in 1858, removed to the Diocese of New York; and was instituted Rector of St. Philips, Philipstown, July 14, 1858. In Jan. 1860, he accepted the post of Chaplain and Superintendent of the Home for the Aged and Orphans, at Brooklyn. His health proved unequal to its duties; and he withdrew a few months since to the Rectorship of the Parishes of Montgomery and Berkshire, in Vermont, closing his work just where it was begun, forty-two years before. It should be added to the particulars already stated, that he represented the Diocese in seven sessions of the General Convention, was 13 years Secretary of the Diocesan Convention, 7 years President of the Standing Committee, and in 1848 was appointed, by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign parts, one of the Board of Agents for the management of its lands in Vermont, and for eight years Secretary of the Board.

It is impossible in our brief limits to express our estimate of Dr. Clapp's character. His most striking excellencies were humility, modesty and kindness; sympathy with sorrow and suffering; and forbearance in judgment. He was also remarkable for an entire surrender of heart and purpose to truth and simplicity. So averre,

indeed, was he to all duplicity, *evasion* or art, that he was sometimes thought to have been too out-spoken, and uncompromising, against all chicanery and artful maneuvering. The character of Dr. Clapp's mind was rather solid, than brilliant. He excelled more in the wise and judicious application of common knowledge to the every day business of ordinary life, than in rare speculations and striking antithesis; more in wise adaptation of common appliances than in the invention of rare and complicated processes, either of thought or action. Hence he was rather a useful than a showy preacher; more distinguished for moral and practical instruction and exhortation, than for metaphysical speculations or philosophical subtleties. With him religion was rather a Faith to be received, a life to lead, than a system of theological opinions.

In his social relations, public and private, he will be long remembered as a faithful minister and judicious counselor; a true friend and affectionate companion. We question if an instance can be found of more devoted affection, among all classes, for one so widely and extensively known.

Imperfect as is our record, enough has been said to show that the memory of Dr. Clapp should be cherished by the Church with feelings of sincere gratitude and high respect.

Died at Morris, Otsego Co., N. Y., Feb. 18, 1861, the REV. RUSSELL WHEELER, aged 77 years. He was born at Brookfield, Conn.; graduated at Williamstown College, Mass., in 1803; was ordained Deacon, by Bishop Jarvis, in the Church of the Holy Trinity, Middletown, Conn., June 6, 1805; and Priest, by the same Bishop, in Christ Church, Watertown, June 4, 1807. His early Ministry was exercised in Danbury and Reading, Conn. He was Rector of Christ Church, Watertown, Conn., when he removed to Western New York, where he was very active and successful in extending and building up the Church. He labored in Unadilla, New Berlin, Lockport, and in other places: where his loyalty to the Church, his popular address, his fine social qualities, and his Christian character made him one of the most useful pioneers of the Church that the Church has known.

The REV. ELI WHEELER died in Brooklyn, N. Y., March 14, 1861, aged 72 years.

The REV. ISAAC F. COX, Assistant Minister of St. Matthew's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., died April 2, 1861, aged 49 years. He was ordained Deacon, under the new Canon, and his history is one of the strongest vindications of the necessity of such a provision. A full sketch of his useful life we have failed thus far to obtain.

#### HEATHENISM IN NEW ENGLAND.

A late (Boston) "Congregational" (Newspaper) has the following.—"In a report made to the General Association of Massachusetts, June 24, 1858, by a committee, of which Rev. Dr. Copp, of Chelsea, was the chairman, it was stated, that according to statistical information recently gathered, embracing Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and Massachusetts, there were not far from two millions of people outside of our churches every Sabbath, and thirteen hundred thousand had no more to do with the Sanctuary of God than the Heathen. These facts were so startling, that many of our clergymen objected to their publication, lest injury should be done."

The Reverend Professor, who stands at the head of the excellent theological seminary at Bangor, in writing, this week, a private letter to a gentleman in this city, uses the following language: "More than half the State of Maine, in point of territory, is as destitute of religious privileges as Hindostan. If the poor people can't have any Ministers, do help them to Sabbath Schools." More attention should be given to the organization of Sunday Schools in these districts which can be found all over New England, not excepting our own State. If the churches will not do it, let some one be sent to do it, as the writer alluded to suggests.

The (Boston) *Tract Journal* for Jan., 1861, has a Quarterly Report from one of the Colporteurs of that Society, in which we find the following:

"A Congregational Clergyman recently stated, in a Ministerial meeting at P., that, of the twelve thousand inhabitants of S. G., and B., not one thousand were regular attendants on Sabbath worship. The church-going people of J., nearly all of S., and F., might safely be estimated in the same ratio. Indeed, I doubt whether, of the nearly thirty thousand people who make up the population of the above towns, two thousand would not be fully up to the average of the actual number, who assemble in all the School Houses and Churches on the Lord's day.

A natural concomitant of this disregard for the house of God is a reckless disrespect for the day itself. There are places in New England, where profane and otherwise wicked men, would as soon risk their reputation for any other odious sin, as overt Sabbath-breaking. Here it has not that stigma. Industrious and honest men, sharing the respect of neighbors, and holding important offices in town and state, make no attempt to conceal their profanations of God's holy day. As they pursue their work or pastime, they seek not the unfrequented road, nor skulk into by- corners, to avoid the few who seek the sanctuary."

#### PRESIDENT ELIOT AND TRINITY COLLEGE.

MR. SAMUEL ELIOT was formally inaugurated President of Trinity College, at Hartford, Conn., April 8th. Among those present, were the President of Harvard College, the Chancellor of Wisconsin University, the President of Wesleyan College, Hon. Mr. Toucey, late Secretary of the Navy, Hon. Thomas H. Seymour, Rev. Drs. Bolles, Wells and Randall, of Boston, together with a large number of the Clergy of this and neighboring States, and a full delegation of the Alumni. The Rt. Rev., the Assistant Bishop of the Diocese, as Vice-Chancellor of the College, performed the ceremony of Inauguration, and delivered an appropriate Address. In an Inaugural Address, the new President then set forth his views of the province of a CHRISTIAN COLLEGE. Let him be sustained, in carrying out those views, by Churchmen, as he deserves, and they are the only sentiments worth sustaining, and the College will rise to its proper position. Churchmen will not send their sons, nor give their money to a College which does not represent and teach a positive Christian Faith, merely because it is called a Church College. An earnest, loyal work, alone commands the confidence and sympathies and endowments of earnest, loyal men.

#### NOBLE BEQUEST TO HOBART COLLEGE.

The Hon. Allen Ayrault, of Geneseo, (W. N. York,) lately deceased, has left a

bequest of \$20,000 to Hobart College, to found a *Professorship of Agriculture* in connection with Chemistry, Mineralogy and Geology. He had previously subscribed \$10,000 towards the endowment of the College, which subscription he names and confirms in his will. Mr. Ayrault has also made the College a residuary legatee to two-fifths of one-third of the property which by reversion shall have accumulated in the hands of the trustee appointed under his will. This portion of the estate may amount to \$25,000, and is to be appropriated to the founding of *Scholarships* for the support of young men studying for the ministry—similar to those, to be founded by the \$10,000, which he had subscribed previously to his death.

The residuary legacy comes to the College without condition, except as to its appropriation to a certain object. The \$10,000 subscription is conditioned on the sum of \$60,000 being subscribed by June 1st, 1861. The \$20,000 for the Professorships, is also conditioned substantially on the making up of the \$60,000 by the 1st of June, with \$3,000 more, for which eight months additional are allowed. Thus, the College has at this moment \$83,000, depending on its securing the balance of the \$60,000 subscription by the 1st of June, 1861, and then raising \$3,000 more by Feb. 4th, 1862.

We learn that the subscription has been fully secured.

#### NASHOTAH THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

We have received the tenth Annual Letter of this Institution, containing the following review of its past history and present condition:

In 1850, there was no permanent edifice to shelter the students—only a few decaying structures of wood. In 1850, ten Candidates for Holy Orders, and four Preparatory students, almost filled the unsuitable buildings. In 1850, but two clergymen, (the Rev. Dr. Adams and the writer,) composed the Faculty. In 1860, Nashotah occupies three substantial edifices: Bishop White Hall beside Nashotah Lake, Kemper Hall and Park Hall, at Racine. In 1860, Nashotah has under daily care sixty students, twenty-seven Candidates, and thirty-three preparing for Candidature. In 1860, two Faculties divide the care and instruction of the young men—the Faculty of Theology at Nashotah, and the College Faculty of Racine. In 1850, there were twelve Alumni of Nashotah; in 1860, the number is fifty-one. Beside the thirty-nine who have graduated during these ten years, several others have been ordained, before completing the course of study, making, with the graduates, sixty that have been added by Nashotah to the ministry.

#### THE ECLECTIC PRINCIPLE AND CHURCH UNITY.

In our Article on the "New Church Missionary Society," in the Oct. No., we stated that the basis on which that Society was organized, and proposed to be conducted, was, in its very nature, destructive of all Church Unity. To show the extent to which this eclectic affinity, or an affinity based on private individual opinions, may lead a man of warm impulses, we give the following, from one of the New York Daily papers. We hardly need add, that Dr. Tyng was a chief agent in the organization of the new Society. We are glad to be able to say, that we do not know another of our Clergymen, in the city or elsewhere, who agrees with the Doctor in his unscriptural Abolitionism; but there are those, who do not disagree with him, in his more recent notions, as to the true source of all real Reform, the

divinely appointed agency for the moral regeneration of the world, the Church of Christ.

"A WAR FOR ABOLITION.

The Rev. Dr. Tyng, of this city, famous, for several years past, for his fondness for commingling politics and religion together in the pulpit, has been holding forth at the anniversary of the Boston American Tract Society during the past week. The Reverend gentleman, among other things, uttered the following:

'Slaveholding—that is, holding men and women in bondage—was a crime. Hear me; (added he, as they were uproarious with applause;) slavery ought to be abolished—slavery must be abolished—slavery can be abolished—slavery shall be abolished—slavery will be abolished—by this war. If to believe that, and to work for it, is Abolitionism, then I'm an Abolitionist.'

Quoting from a South side Clergyman, who argued that slavery was a divine institution—'Yes,' said the Doctor, 'as hell is a divine institution, and destined, I hope, to go to the devil at the close of this war.'

Comment upon such language is unnecessary. It is simply revolting. He has said even worse things than all this at a late meeting in New York.

ANOTHER HUMBUG EXPLODED.

Some time since, in the *Episcopal Recorder* and other papers, there appeared an account of a very wonderful stone, called "The Holy Stone," lately discovered in Newark, Ohio. The following paper, from the "*Kentucky State Flag*," puts the matter in its true light.

"THE HOLY STONE."

Much curiosity has been excited by the discovery, a few months since, in the mounds of Newark, Ohio, of a novaculite, in shape like the Keystone of an arch, and covered with the following inscriptions, in Hebrew, viz:

THE HOLY OF HOLIES,  
THE KING OF EARTH,  
\* THE LAW OF JEHOVAH,  
THE WORD OF JEHOVAH.

These sentences are incised, and on each of the four sides of the stone.

The claim made in its behalf is, substantially, that it is a work of remote antiquity, of Masonic character; and, being found in the mounds, affords presumptive evidence, that this continent was inhabited, centuries ago, by an intellectual people, whose affinities were Shemitic, and perhaps Jewish. In fact it has been used to support the notion that our aborigines are descended from the "Lost Tribes of Israel."

These claims, we think, are conclusively met by a paper read at the late annual meeting of the American Oriental Society, (one of the most select of all our learned Societies,) by our townsman, the Rev. J. A. MERRICK, PH. D. The paper received the endorsement of all present.

Here is an extract, which we take from the printed "Proceedings" of the Society, a copy of which has been sent us:

" . . . . You have doubtless seen newspaper notices of the alleged discovery, in excavating a mound in Newark, Ohio, of a peculiarly shaped stone, described as a truncated pyramid, four or five inches long, and marked on its four sides with Hebrew characters. It claims to be an Oriental symbol, of unknown antiquity,



and of a Masonic origin, and, for these reasons, has attracted some attention from Oriental scholars and antiquarians in different sections of the country."

"It is almost needless for me to state, that, having been asked my opinion by interested parties, it was unhesitatingly given adversely to the genuineness of the monument as an ancient symbol, or as a work of any character anterior to our own day. Indeed, you will see, by the photographed and traced copies of it herewith forwarded to your address, that it carries its condemnation on its face, as a bungling imitation of the *printed* Chaldee letters in our later editions of the Hebrew Bible."

The "Proceedings" adds the following note, embodying the judgment of the Society.

"The copies, sent by Mr. Merrick, were passed around among the members present, and no person was found disposed to differ from the opinion expressed by that gentleman, while some surprise was manifested, that so transparent a fraud, or piece of pleasantry, should have made so much stir, and deceived so many people."

Thus it may be settled, that the "Holy Stone" is neither very ancient, nor Masonic, but something like Joe Smith's celebrated copper-plates, though the discoverer is, evidently, an honest man.

#### KENTUCKY.

The Rt. Rev. Bishop Smith, in his Address to the late Convention, notices at length the fact, that two distinguished Methodist preachers, Rev. Dr. Ralston, and Rev. Dr. Parsons, the former having been already ordained in the Church, and the latter become a Candidate for Orders, have both returned to their former connection. The Bishop states very clearly the causes which are leading to an increasing dissatisfaction with Methodism, and then adds: "To promote the sacred ends of peace and charity, it is here earnestly submitted, that these causes are at work on so large a scale, and are at this moment exerting so powerful an influence, that no amount of clamor or of opposition can by any means arrest their progress. On the other hand, all violent measures, designed to produce this effect, cannot possibly fail of injuring the cause they are intended to promote. The tendency of primitive Methodism to expire by its own limitations; and the tendency of the more highly educated Methodist mind to seek and to find repose within the sacred inclosures of our common Mother Church, is irrepressible. Calm and quiet acquiescence in a fact so fixed and well defined, is the true wisdom of all concerned."

The return of Drs. Ralston and Parsons to the Methodists is to be accounted for, we think, on another ground. They entered, or proposed to enter the Church, from mere expediency or preference, as into a mere Sect among Sects. We venture the assertion, that they never seriously sat down to meet the question, whether JESUS CHRIST, through the HOLY GHOST, and by the Inspired Apostles, established, and for all time, some particular Church, some particular Sacraments, some particular Ministry, some particular Lord's Day, some particular New Testament, some particular Government, some particular Faith, some particular Worship. All these stand or fall together, on the same method of argument; and the development of Modern Systems is proving, that where one of them is laid aside, the rest will, by necessary consequence, sooner or later disappear. We pledge ourselves to prove this, to a demonstration, to any one who will pledge himself to abide by the argument, fairly presented. The great difficulty is, an unwillingness to meet the question, with that docility of temper which it demands.

**DISPLACEMENT OF THE REV. C. B. TAYLOR, OF CALIFORNIA.**

The Rev. C. B. Taylor, late of Marysville, having violated, wilfully and stubbornly, the Canons of the Church, in officiating for a factious congregation in San Francisco, the Standing Committee having forbidden him to do so, Bishop Kip, on his return, appointed a Court to try him. The Judges were, the Rev. Drs. Ver Mehr, of San Francisco, Gassman, of Sonora, and the Rev. Mr. McDonald, of Stockton. Mr. Taylor, having been found guilty, has been displaced from the Ministry by Bishop Kip. The notorious Rev. Starr King, the Unitarian Infidel, subsequently lectured for the benefit of Mr. Taylor, and Mr. Taylor accepted the sop. Loyalty to the Church need expect no better treatment anywhere than it has received in California; and the sympathy with Mr. Taylor is a part of the same game which is played, in one way or another, in the older States. The old hate of the Church is not dead, it is as bitter as ever. It solemnly flatters and praises whom, at heart, it despises, and whom, behind the curtain, it laughs at.

**CONVERSIONS TO THE CHURCH.**

The Standing Committee of the Diocese of Illinois have recommended the Bishop to receive Mr. John Crouch, (formerly a Methodist minister,) as a candidate for Holy Orders. This makes the third Minister "of another denomination" who has applied to be received as a candidate for our Ministry within six months, in the diocese of Illinois alone.

Testimonials in favor of Edward Squires, late a Minister in the Unitarian denomination, recommending him to be admitted a candidate for Holy Orders, in the Diocese of Massachusetts, have been received.

The Rev. Alexander Shand, admitted to Deacon's Orders, by Bishop McCoskry, March 12th, was formerly a Presbyterian minister.

The Rev. L. H. Jackson, recently ordained Deacon in Maryland, was formerly a Methodist exhorter.

Rev. Mr. Juny, of Kentucky, (late a Roman Catholic priest,) has been admitted to the Ministry of our Church by the Bishop of Illinois, and has commenced services in the French language, for the French Protestants of Chicago. He is attached to the "Bishop's chapel," as one of his chaplains. Mr. Juny is a gentleman of fine accomplishments and high character, and is every way adapted for his interesting work.

On the 19th of May, Bishop Bedell, at Bellefontaine, Ohio, confirmed eight persons, including a clergyman recently of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, who has also applied to become a Candidate for Orders in the Church.

At a late Convention of the Diocese of Missouri, at Hannibal, May 23d, the opening sermon was preached by the Rev. Dr. McMasters, at the close of which an interesting and rather novel incident occurred. Seated in a chair in front of the chancel was a dignified-looking clergyman, whom Bishop Hawks, in some very appropriate remarks, introduced to the Convention and congregation as the Rev. Ignatius Koch, late a priest of the Church of Rome, who had abjured its errors, and now sought admission to the communion and ministry of our Reformed Catholic Church. Mr. K. then read his renunciation of the corruptions of Popery, and promise of conformity and obedience to the doctrine, discipline, and worship of the

Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America; when the Bishop put to him the questions in the office for the "Ordering of Priests," and then, taking him by the right hand, received him to the office and work of a Priest in the Church of God, and invited him to a seat in the chancel. Mr. Koch is a scholar, and gentleman of unblemished reputation, who enters the Church with high testimonials from various quarters. He has long resided in Weston, in that Diocese, where he has ministered to a large German congregation, who are strongly attached to him.

PENNSYLVANIA.—PARISH BOUNDARIES: DIVISION OF THE  
DIOCESE.

The recent Convention of this Diocese, took the following action on both those important points.

The first regulation being read, it was adopted, as follows:

It is hereby declared, in accordance with the 2d paragraph of the 2d section of the Canon of the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, that the sanction or veto of the formation of a new parish, or the establishment of a new church, or congregation, in any part of this Diocese, shall be vested in the Bishop of the Diocese, or, in case of his absence or inability, in the Assistant Bishop, if there be one, acting by and with the advice of the Standing Committee, and in case of there being no Bishop in the ecclesiastical authority: *Provided*, that an appeal may be taken therefrom at the next Diocesan Convention, whose decision shall be final: *Provided, also*, that nothing in this resolution shall affect the legal and vested rights of any parish.

Rev. Dr. Wilmer, from the Committee to whom was referred the subject of the division of the Diocese, made the following report:

*Whereas*, In the present disturbed condition of our country, it is not probable that any portion of the present Diocese of Pennsylvania will be in a condition to form a new and independent Diocese, therefore,

*Resolved*, That the Committee on the Division of the Diocese be continued, with power to report at a future period upon the subject committed to their attention. The report was adopted.

In respect to Parish boundaries, there was an attempt made to pass a Resolution, which would have opened the way for all sorts of intermeddling, but it was promptly put down by the strong conservative vote of 80 to 41 of the Clergy. The Lay vote was not taken.

CHURCH RELATIONS IN THE CONFEDERATE STATES.

Bishop Gregg, of Texas, has issued a Pastoral Letter, from which we make the following extracts. "I have very recently received from the Right Rev. Leonidas Polk, D. D., Bishop of Louisiana, and the Right Rev. Stephen Elliott, Jr., D. D., Bishop of Georgia, a communication, which they have been induced to make as the Senior Bishops in the Confederate States, proposing a Convention at Montgomery, Alabama, on the 3d of July next, to be composed of the Bishops of the said dioceses, and of three Clerical and three Lay Deputies, from each, to be appointed by their respective Diocesan Conventions. The object of this Convention will be, to consult upon such matters as may have arisen out of the changes in our civil affairs; and,

especially, as touching the relations of the dioceses within the Confederate States to the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States.

'It is thought better,' in the language of the said communication 'that these relations should be arranged by the common consent of all the Dioceses within the Confederate States, than by the independent action of each Diocese. The one will probably lead to harmonious action, the other might produce inconvenient diversity.'

If there are elements of change which cannot be overruled or controlled, a fraternal interchange of views and harmonious action will, doubtless, give to these changes a right direction.

If again the general sentiment of the Church, North and South, should ultimately be found to tend to the expediency of a severance of the ecclesiastical unity, heretofore existing, then friendly consultation on our part, as preparatory to the final action of the General Convention, would be every way desirable.

Or, if there may be ecclesiastically a union, as there is, unquestionably, in doctrine and feeling, a unity of the Church Catholic, which is above all nationalities—the course here suggested, under the peculiar circumstances in which we are placed, will be most likely to lead to its recognition.

And if, in accordance with this latter view, (though our present ecclesiastical organization should have to give way to the force of circumstances,) another should be established, providing, as a bond of Union, for a General Council of the Church in all the States, to meet once in six years, or at longer intervals of time—and legislate on matters affecting the Church in its Catholicity, as its Liturgy and Faith—with Provincial Synods, composed of Dioceses contiguous and naturally falling together, meeting once in three years, to take charge of their missionary and other local work—the Annual Diocesan Convention assembling, of course, as heretofore—an end would have been attained, most important in the consequences resulting from the spectacle of such a union, for the Church and the world, as well as in the happy effects directly upon the great body of the faithful—an end, for which the mind of the Church seems to have been gradually preparing, and which many earnest hearts have longed to bring about.

May every change be directed aright, and the course of this world so peaceably ordered by God's governance, that His Church may joyfully serve Him in all godly quietness, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

You will perceive, from the foregoing, the reasons for this movement at the present time.

Before the last of June, the Conventions of all the Dioceses within the Confederate States will have met.

And it was foreseen that, unless joint action, as in the proposed Convention at Montgomery, should be agreed upon, there would be independent Diocesan action, leading to inconvenient diversity, and to a severance, moreover, of those bonds, which have united us so long and so happily with our Northern brethren.

What the result of this general consultation will be, cannot be foreseen. Whatever action may be taken, will be marked by calmness, moderation, and a spirit of peace and love.

If it can be made to appear that some bond of union may continue to exist, as suggested in my address, it will be ground of rejoicing.

The thought of a violent rending of the Church, or of a separation, if such must needs be, otherwise than as brethren and friends, is not for a moment to be enter-

tained. We bless God for the spectacle of union, and of unity, which the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country has ever presented to the world.

And, whatever its future history may be, we feel assured it will be only such as we would desire to see written.

Peace on earth, and good will towards men, will be, as of old, the message proclaimed.

You will join me, I know, in fervent prayers to God, that His good Spirit may be with us in our counsels, and that His Church may be one; evermore preserving the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.

ALEXANDER GREGG, BISHOP OF TEXAS.

*Austin, April 15, 1861.*

Deputies to the proposed Convention have been appointed by all (we believe) of the Conventions of the Confederate States. We had proposed to give, in this No. of the Review, a paper from one of the soundest and ablest Canonists of our Church, on the question of Church Unity as affected by our present political relations. It seems better however to await the action of the Convention at Montgomery. The whole subject will however, we trust, be met by the entire Church, both North and South, in that fraternal and that Catholic spirit which is due to so grave a matter. Especially do we hope that hasty legislation will be avoided on all sides.

---

## SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

### CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOP OF WORCESTER.

The Rev. Dr. HENRY PHILPOTT was consecrated to the See of Worcester, on Monday, March 25th, at Lambeth Palace. The officiating Prelates were, the Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishops of London and Llandaff. The Sermon upon the occasion was by the Rev. E. H. Browne, Norrisian Professor of Divinity, of Cambridge, in which he advocated, strongly, an increase of the Episcopate in England. Rev. Dr. Henry Philpott, entered St. Catherine College, Cambridge, (then called Catherine Hall,) in 1825, and in 1829 took his first degree of Bachelor of Arts, when he was first class in classics, and the senior wrangler of his year, the present Duke of Devonshire being second wrangler. In the contest for "Smith's Prizeman," Mr. Philpott stood second, the present Duke of Devonshire ranking first. On the death of Dr. Proctor, 1845, Mr. Philpott, who was then a Fellow, was elected to the Mastership of St. Catherine College, and succeeded to the Canonry Residentiary in Norwich Cathedral, which is attached to the mastership. Two years afterwards, he proceeded to the degree of Doctor in Divinity, and more recently became chaplain to Prince Albert. Dr. Philpott has been three times Vice-Chancellor, and is one of the most popular men in the University.

### CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOP OF CENTRAL AFRICA.

The Rt. Rev. F. C. MACKENZIE, Missionary Bishop to the Native tribes of Southern Africa, was consecrated in the Cathedral at Cape Town, Jan. 1, 1861, Feast of

the Circumcision, by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Grey, Metropolitan, and the Bishops of Natal, (Colenso,) and of St. Helena, (Claughton.) The following was the Oath of Obedience to the Metropolitan Bishop: "In the name of God, Amen. I, Charles Frederick Mackenzie, chosen Bishop of the Mission to the tribes dwelling in the neighborhood of the Lake Nyassa and River Shire, do profess and promise all due reverence and obedience to the Metropolitan Bishop and Metropolitan Church of Capetown, and to their successors. So help me God, through Jesus Christ." The Dean of Capetown preached a strong Sermon. The Heathen population, among whom the Bishop is to labor, number about 170,000. The sons of two of the most powerful Chiefs, are about to complete their education at St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, England.

#### CONSECRATION OF A MISSIONARY BISHOP OF THE WESTERN ISLANDS OF THE PACIFIC OCEAN.

On St. Matthias Day, Feb. 24, 1861, the Rev. J. C. PATESON was consecrated "Missionary Bishop of the Western Islands of the Pacific Ocean," in St. Paul's Church, Auckland, by the Bishop of New Zealand, (Selwyn,) assisted by the Bishop of Wellington, (Charles,) and the Bishop of Nelson, (Hobhouse.) Bishop Pateson has, for many years, been a successful Missionary to the Heathen among the Islands of the Pacific. An English writer says: "no more important event has occurred in the English Church since the Reformation. The certificate of consecration sets forth, that the ceremony was performed according to the rites of the Church of England, except the Queen's mandate, which was not required, the Bishop not having any jurisdiction within her Majesty's dominions.

#### DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF MADRAS.

The Rt. Rev. THOMAS DEALTRY, D. D., Bishop of Madras, died March 4, 1861. He was the son of James Dealtry, Esq., descended from the ancient family of Dealtry of Lofthouse Hall, near Wakefield, Yorkshire. He was born at Nottingley, near Pontefract, 1795; married first, 1819, daughter of H. Stovin Maw, Esq., of Belle Vue, Doncaster; secondly, 1824, daughter of John Sedger, Esq., of London; educated at Catharine Hall, Cambridge, where he graduated LL. B. in 1828, and was in the first class of the law tripos; created Archdeacon of Calcutta by Bishop Wilson, in 1835, and held that office, until consecrated Bishop of Madras in 1849, on the resignation of Bishop Spencer. He has published sermons on various occasions.

The Queen has approved the appointment of the Rev. Frederick Gell, B. D.. (Fellow and late Tutor of Christ's College, Cambridge, and Domestic Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of London,) to the Bishopric of Madras, which was rendered vacant by the death of the late Rev. Dr. Dealtry. Mr. Gell is the younger son of the Rev. Philip Gell, of Derby. He was educated at Rugby School, under Dr. Arnold, and, having obtained the first Exhibition in 1839, he entered at Trinity College, Cambridge. The *Times* says Mr. Gell has been warmly recommended both by the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London.

---

NOTE.—We are again unexpectedly compelled to omit a full summary of Foreign Intelligence.